

# **SOME IMPORTANT SOTERIOLOGICAL TERMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: A STUDY IN BIBLICAL SEMANTICS**

David Hill

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1964

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13659>

This item is protected by original copyright

SOME IMPORTANT SOTERIOLOGICAL TERMS  
IN THE  
NEW TESTAMENT  
- A STUDY IN BIBLICAL SEMANTICS -

being a thesis presented by  
DAVID HILL

to  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS,  
SCOTLAND

in application for the degree  
of  
Doctor of Philosophy

February, 1964.





ProQuest Number: 10166610

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166610

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Tu 5213

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by me, that the thesis is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree.

The research was carried out in St.Mary's College, in the University of St.Andrews, under the direction of the Very Reverend Principal Matthew Black, D.D., F.B.A., and the Reverend Dr. R. McL. Wilson.



## CERTIFICATE

I certify that DAVID HILL has spent nine terms in Research work at St.Mary's College in the University of St.Andrews, that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance No. 16, and that he is qualified to submit the following thesis in application for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1



## STATEMENT

Following primary and secondary education in my home town, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, I proceeded to the Queen's University, Belfast, in which I gained the degree of Bachelor of Arts, with Second Class Honours in Classics, in July, 1956. I first matriculated in the University of St.Andrews in October, 1956, and was awarded the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, with Distinction in New Testament, by the University in June, 1959.

After graduation in St.Andrews, I proceeded, as one of the Scottish Fellows, to Union Theological Seminary, New York, in which I was awarded the Degree of Master of Sacred Theology in June, 1960.

In October, 1961 I returned to St.Mary's College, St.Andrews, and was admitted then as a Research student. Since that date I have remained in residence in St.Andrews during the 3 terms of each academic year and in 2 summer vacations. Thus I have completed 9 terms in full-time research within the University to which this thesis is submitted in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.





To

MICHEL and JOE

Eden & Co.

Bond

TUB SIZES - AIR DRIED



## PREFACE

My attention was first directed to the importance of the study of Biblical Semantics by a discussion which I had with Principal Matthew Black and Dr. R. McL. Wilson in May, 1961. The work of Professor James Barr entitled The Semantics of Biblical Language had just then been published and its significance for the Biblical interpreter and theologian was immediately recognisable. Careful consideration of Barr's book confirmed Dr. Black's and Dr. Wilson's opinion as to its timeliness and value: it revealed also the scope, indeed, the necessity, for further work in this field. In order to pursue this as a research project I came to St. Mary's College, and the two scholars who first stimulated my interest in the subject became the joint-supervisors of my work. To them I owe a great debt of gratitude. It is a pleasure to pay tribute to Principal Black's reassuring interest and valuable direction throughout the preparation of this thesis, and to acknowledge Dr. Wilson's patience, accessibility and careful guidance on many points. To be informed by their scholarly judgments and to be supported by their understanding has been an enriching experience.

A work on Biblical Semantics might have been expected to involve itself fully with discussion of the science of



linguistics and the philosophy of language. That this emphasis is not found in this thesis is due to the fact that I cannot claim to be adequately equipped to deal with such subjects, the examination of which, in any case, scarcely belongs to a dissertation prepared within the Faculty of Divinity. It has seemed the better course, therefore, to gain some acquaintance with the basic principles of linguistic semantics, to evaluate Barr's use of the science of linguistics in criticism of recent Biblical Theology, and then to establish more positive methods of approach to the language of the New Testament, by means of which the meaning of important theological terms is elucidated. At least four of the five words chosen for investigation are of such significance in the New Testament that it would have been impossible to read, much less to assess, the many studies which seek to expound their meanings in Christian theology. I have limited to a minimum my use of such books. Moreover, it has not been possible for me to consult even every modern commentary on, or exegetical discussion of the various passages in which the selected terms occur. Time alone would not permit this. In any case, a work which establishes a method of investigation and proceeds to apply it may reasonably claim the right to approach the material afresh and to draw its conclusions with some measure of independence. Nevertheless, although I



have not always sought to find the extent of my agreement or disagreement with other writers, at many important critical points I acknowledge indebtedness to the viewpoints of leading British and Continental commentators.

Since this work entered its final stages, some of the opinions offered in it have found confirmation in the writings of others. For instance, in an article entitled "The Present State of Old Testament Theology" (Expository Times, lxxv, December 1963, pp. 70-74) Professor N.W. Porteous draws attention to Barr's failure to recognise that important overtones of meaning may belong to many Biblical terms as a result of their frequent theological use. J. Dupont's study of the phrase "poor in spirit" in the Hebrew Old Testament and in the Qumran Scrolls (in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für J. Schmid, Regensburg, 1963) lends support to the interpretation of the phrase in the New Testament as referring, not simply to the poverty-stricken, but to those who humbly and trustfully submit to the will of God. One important book came into my hands too late to be taken into account in the section on the Old Testament use of Ruach. It is Daniel Lys' study Rûach: le souffle dans l'Ancien Testament (Paris, 1962). I may be allowed to say, however, that the use of this book would not have altered substantially my own presentation and interpretation of the evidence.



Having gratefully acknowledged my indebtedness to my supervisors, I may now record my thanks to others who have helped at various stages in my work.

To the Staff of the University Library, St. Andrews I am grateful for their provision of research facilities and their co-operation in tracing and borrowing books and periodicals.

During my research studentship I have been generously supported by the Honyman-Gillespie Scholarship. To the Trustees of this fund I am indebted for the award made in my favour.

Miss Jessie L. Millet, Secretary to the Dean of the Faculty of Science, College Gate, St. Andrews, undertook the immense task of typing this work. My thanks are due to her for her conscientiousness, speed and accuracy, as they are due to (though not expected by) my friend, M. Michel Méheust, who patiently and carefully proof-read the entire work before it was transmitted to the typist. Such a great kindness costs much in time and energy, but it is indicative of the character of his friendship. To him, therefore, and to another friend who, though not present in St. Andrews, contributed much by his interest and encouragement, let the completed work be dedicated.



CONTENTS

	Page
Declaration	ii
Certificate	iii
Statement	iv
Preface	vi
Abbreviations	xiv
 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	 1
Consideration of Professor Barr's recent work <u>The Semantics of Biblical Language</u>	 3
The Nature of New Testament Greek	18
The Principles Underlying the Word-Studies	22
The Selection of Words for Study	29
 A. <u>THE INTERPRETATION OF ἰλάσκεσθαι AND RELATED WORDS</u> <u>in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, with</u> <u>special reference to Romans 3:25</u>	   31
The Septuagint Usage and its Hebrew Background	32
The New Testament Usage	54
Romans 3:25	59
 B. <u>THE BACKGROUND AND USAGE OF λύτρον and cognate</u> <u>words in Biblical Greek</u>	  76
I. Classical Greek Usage	77
II. The Old Testament Background	84



	Page
III. The Words in the Septuagint	92
IV. The Usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls	101
V. The Use of the <i>λύτρον</i> - words in Philo	105
VI. Redemption in Judaism: Rabbinic and other sources	110
VII. The New Testament Usage	116
VIII. Concluding Summary	140

C. <u>THE BACKGROUND AND USAGE OF <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> and cognate words in Biblical Greek</u>	142
I. <i>נָדָב</i> and related words in the Old Testament	143
Observations on the Semantics of the <i>sdq</i> -words	168
II. <i>Δίκαιος</i> and related words in Greek usage	174
Appended note on G. Schrenk's study of <i>δικαιοσύνη</i>	183
III. The Septuagint	187
IV. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	197
V. Philo Judaeus	199
VI. The Dead Sea Scrolls	202
VII. The Rabbinic Literature	211
VIII. The <i>Δίκαιος</i> -words in the New Testament	222
Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels	222
Part 2. Paul	258

VOLUME TWO

D. <u>THE BACKGROUND AND BIBLICAL USAGE OF THE TERMS <i>ζωή</i> and <i>ζωή αἰώνιος</i></u>	309
I. The Old Testament Usage	310



	Page
Supplementary Note on the form $\square \pi \square$	321
II. The Classical Greek Usage of $\xi \omega \eta$	322
III. The Usage of the Septuagint	326
IV. The Inter-Testamental Literature	328
V. Philo Judaeus	333
VI. The Hermetic Literature	339
VII. The Rabbinic Literature	344
VIII. The Dead Sea Scrolls	349
IX. The Meaning and Use of $\alpha \iota \omega \nu \iota \circ \varsigma$	355
X. The Use of $\xi \omega \eta \alpha \iota \omega \nu \iota \circ \varsigma$ in the New Testament	362
Part 1. Paul	362
Part 2. The Synoptic Gospels	367
Part 3. The Fourth Gospel	369
XI. Summary	385
E. <u>THE BACKGROUND AND BIBLICAL USAGE OF <math>\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha</math></u>	386
I. The Old Testament Use of $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha$	387
II. The Classical Greek Usage of $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha$	409
III. The Usage of the Septuagint	416
IV. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	421
V. Philo Judaeus	427
VI. The Rabbinic Literature	435
VII. The Dead Sea Scrolls	450
VIII. The New Testament Usage	464
Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels	464



	Page
Part 2. The Acts of the Apostles	497
Part 3. The Writings of Paul	512
Part 4. The Gospel of John	550
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	563
The Findings of the Word-Studies	564
The Word-Studies in relation to the issues raised by Professor Barr	574
Bibliography: Books by Modern Authors	585
Periodical Literature	595



## ABBREVIATIONS

AJT	American Journal of Theology.
BASOR	Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research.
BDB	<u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,</u> by F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs: Oxford University Press, 1907, reprinted 1959.
ET	The Expository Times.
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament
HDB	<u>Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible,</u> 5th edition, Edinburgh, T.T. Clark, 1906, and revised edition, (ed. H.H. Rowley), Edinburgh, 1963.
HTR	The Harvard Theological Review
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
IDB	<u>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,</u> 4 vols., Abingdon Press: New York and Nashville, 1962
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KB	<u>Lexicon in veteris testamenti libros,</u> L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Leiden, 1953.
LS	<u>A Greek-English Lexicon,</u> by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott; revised ed. by H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie, Oxford, 1940.
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
NEB	The New English Bible
NT	Novum Testamentum



NTS	New Testament Studies
PRJ	<u>Paul and Rabbinic Judaism</u> , by W.D. Davies, 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1955.
PTR	Princeton Theological Review
RB	Revue Biblique
RGG	<u>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</u> , 3te Auf., Tübingen, 1956.
RSV	The Revised Standard Version of the Bible
SB	<u>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</u> , by H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Munich, 1922-28.
SEA	Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
ST	Studia Theologica
TBlätt	Theologische Blätter
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
TWNT	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u> , ed. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich, Stuttgart, from 1933.
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VGT	<u>Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</u> , ed. J.R. Moulton and G. Milligan, London: 1914-1929.
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissen- schaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen- schaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

The abbreviation LXX refers to the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. The edition used is Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart: 1935.



The accepted abbreviations for the Dead Sea Scrolls are used.

CD	The Damascus Document (Fragments of a Zadokite Work)
1QM	War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness
1QH	The Hymns of Thanksgiving
1QS	The Manual of Discipline
1Qper Hab.	The Habakkuk Commentary
4Q per Ps.	Fragments of Commentary on Psalms from Cave 4.

The Scriptural and Rabbinic abbreviations are customary or self-explanatory.

The abbreviations for Philo's works used by H.A. Wolfson (Philo, 2 vols. Harvard University Press, 1947) have been adopted.

Abr.	De Abrahamo
Aet.	De Aeternitate Mundi
Agr.	De Agricultura
Cher.	De Cherubim
Conf.	De Confusione Linguarum
Congr.	De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia
Cont.	De Vita Contemplativa
Decal.	De Decalogo
Deter.	Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat
Ebr.	De Ebrietate
Flac.	In Flaccum
Fug.	De Fuga et Inventionem
Gig.	De Gigantibus
Heres	Quis Herum Divinarum Heres
Hypoth.	Hypothetica
Immut.	Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis
Jos.	De Josepho
Leg. All.	Legum Allegoria
Legat.	Legatio ad Caium
Migr.	De Migratione Abrahami
Mos.	De Vita Mosis
Mut.	De Mutatione Nominum
Opif.	De Opificio Mundi
Plant.	De Plantatione
Post.	De Posteritate Caini
Praem.	De Praemiis et Poenis



Probus	Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit
Provid.	De Providentia
Qu. in Exod.	Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum
Qu. in Gen.	Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin
Sacr.	De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini
Sobr.	De Sobrietate
Somn.	De Somniis
Spec.	De Specialibus Legibus
Virt.	De Virtutibus.

The commonly accepted abbreviations for the names of authors and their works in the Classical Greek and Inter-testamental literatures are used throughout the work.



## INTRODUCTION

In his lecture "The Bible and Current Theories about Language", delivered before the Victoria Institute in 1954, Professor Malcolm Guthrie of London University made this statement:

There can be few subjects receiving scholarly attention today that have more direct relevance to questions connected with the Bible than the study of language. Nevertheless there do not seem to have been many attempts to examine the results of recent developments in this linguistic field which may bear on this Book that claims to be the Word of God expressed in the language of men. 1

As his lecture makes clear, Dr. Guthrie is interested in the relevance to Biblical studies of such general linguistic questions as the origins of language, its nature and its function. Nevertheless, the more specialised aspects of the science of linguistics, and particularly the methods of semantic investigation, may also be included within the scope of his comment. There has been a conspicuous lack of serious interest in the discussions and problems of linguistic semantics on the part of those who seek to understand and interpret the ancient languages of Scripture. 2

Recently the attention of Biblical scholars has been drawn

---

1 Dr. Guthrie is Professor of Bantu Languages and Head of the Department of the Languages and Cultures of Africa. His lecture was reproduced in The Bible Translator, V, (1954), pp.150-159. The quotation is from p.150.

2 The blame for this state of affairs does not lie solely with the theologians, whose education in Biblical languages



to this situation by the appearance of Professor James Barr's book The Semantics of Biblical Language,<sup>1</sup> a volume which courageously reveals the misleading methods and erroneous conclusions in exegesis which ignorance or neglect of the basic principles of linguistic semantics has allowed to gain acceptance within the movement for Biblical Theology.<sup>2</sup> Since Barr's critical study provided the initial

and approach to Biblical texts is directed towards the assessing of literary content rather than towards systematic description of a language and analysis of its structure: the linguists, on their part, have failed to inform the theologians, in any appropriate way, of the methods and findings of their science, and seem to neglect discussion of the special character of the language of a religious tradition.

1 Oxford University Press, 1961. See also "Hypostatization of Linguistic Phenomena in Modern Theological Interpretation", JSS, VII, (1962) pp.85-94, which carries further the author's criticism of the practice of extracting linguistic phenomena from the syntactical environment in which their linguistic functioning takes place: also the more cautious, less negative study, Biblical Words for Time (London, SCM: 1962) in which he treats of the interpretation of these words in the writings of J. Marsh, J.A.T. Robinson and Oscar Cullmann.

2 "Biblical Theology" may be understood either as a solely descriptive discipline revealing the theology (or theologies) contained in the Bible, or as a kind of dogmatics with the Bible as its only source of authority. See G. Ebeling, "The Meaning of Biblical Theology", JTS (NS), VI, 1955 pp.210-25 and P.S. Watson, "The Nature and Function of Biblical Theology", ET, LXXIII, (1962), pp.195-200. But much that may be included under the name tries to unite both understandings, i.e. to be descriptive and dogmatic at the same time. To do this, it proceeds from a contrast drawn between Hebrew and Greek thinking to a synthetic view of the Biblical material in terms of dominant Hebraic thought-patterns. It is of the methods of this intermediate kind of Biblical theology that Barr is most critical. See also "Biblical Theology: Past and Future" by D.H. Wallace, TZ, XIX, (1963) pp.88-105.



impetus for our undertaking to make a more positive contribution to Biblical semantics, it is fitting that the main themes of his book should be indicated.

#### CONSIDERATION OF PROFESSOR BARR'S RECENT WORK

While Barr makes the object of his attack the popular contemporary school of Biblical Theology, it is not the prevailing conclusions of this school which he criticises, but the insecure, if not definitely unsound, linguistic methods and assumptions which characterise the writings of some of its outstanding exponents. One of the basic presuppositions of this Biblical Theology is that a vast difference in views of reality existed between the Biblical and Greek worlds, the one characterised by "Hebraic" modes of conception, the other by "Graeco-Hellenistic". The differences between these are thought to consist of the contrast between dynamic and static ways of thinking and expression, the contrast between abstract and concrete, and the contrast in the conceptions of time and of man. Barr claims that the purpose of his book is not to question the validity of this contrast, but rather to expose the faulty linguistic basis on which it is argued, especially by Th. Boman.<sup>1</sup> He and other

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew Thought compared with Greek, (London, SCM) 1960. Cf. also his contribution to Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. W. Klassen and G.F. Snyder, (London, SCM, 1962) entitled "Hebrew and Greek Thought-forms in the New Testament". Barr is aware of the value of this contrast, but observes that its existence and use are not dependent on its extension into a contrast of linguistic phenomena.



writers claim that these particular features of Hebrew thinking are built into the Hebrew language and that the examination of Hebrew as a linguistic phenomenon will therefore point directly to the mental patterns behind it. Now it is clear that this kind of argument has been developed with complete disregard of the discipline of linguistic semantics. The failure to engage in a comprehensive study of the Hebrew verb-system has permitted the claim that Hebrew thinking is "dynamic" because the verb in Hebrew always expresses movement and activity; whereas, in fact, there are many stative, intransitive verbs in Hebrew which do not express action, and the forms 'yesh, "there is", and 'ayin or 'en, "there is not", may come near to possessing the significance of absolute existence or non-existence in certain contexts. The domination of assumed modes of thinking over the investigation of linguistic peculiarities has caused a sharp distinction to be drawn between the "aspectual" system of the Hebrew verb (an index to the Hebrew understanding of time) and the "tense" system of the Indo-European verb; yet, in Greek, for example, an "aspect" system for verbs is strongly represented. Furthermore, can it be seriously maintained that the Hebrew language discloses the distinctiveness of Israelite theological thinking when it is recalled that, structurally, Hebrew is no more than a Semitic language and shares many of its features with the whole Semitic family of languages?



The idea of a correlation between language and thought has led to a number of abuses at the level of vocabulary studies. Among these are (1) the adding of significances: where several Hebrew words are found translating one English term, the significance of each word is regarded as an aspect of the total reality in the thought-structure, and these various aspects are brought together to form, as it were, the reality for theological interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Such a procedure ignores the existence of synonyms and the theory behind it ignores the phenomenon of polysemy, i.e. the fact that one word can have more than one sense. Linguistic material is being subjected to a systematising theological method. (2) the dependence on etymologies: the original meaning of a word is regarded as a firm guide to subsequent usage and as necessarily present in all proper usage; moreover, it is assumed that an appeal to etymology will lead to the right sense in the interpretation of difficult or ambiguous words. In opposition to this view, Barr emphasises that etymology is no sure guide to the semantic value of words in their current usage, but

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, (ET, London, 1958) pp.156-57. Hebrew has four words which may be roughly translated "man" - 'adam, 'ish, 'enos and geber. Jacob discusses the meaning of each and concludes, "If it is true that 'adam insists on the human kind, 'enos on his feebleness, 'ish on his power and geber on his strength, then we can say that added together they indicate that man according to the OT is a perishable creature, who lives only as the member of a group, but that he is also a powerful being, capable of choice and dominion". See Semantics, pp.144ff.



that such value has to be determined from the current usage itself and not from derivation. The etymology of a word, he maintains, is not a statement about its meaning, but about its history, and the historical past of a word is not a reliable guide to its present meaning. (3) the root fallacy, which assumes that the "root meaning" is a basic part of the actual semantic value of any word or form which can be assigned to an identifiable root, and that any word may be presumed to contain some suggestion of other words formed from the same root.<sup>1</sup> This procedure often amounts to much the same thing as "etymologising", the "root" being regarded as providing the original meaning or as expressing the concept or idea. But Barr points out that the "meaning" of a root is not necessarily part of the meaning of a derived form, and that two words having the same root need not suggest one another, e.g. lehem, "bread" and milhamah, "war". The distinction between grammatical variations of a root form and fresh word-formation must be kept in mind.

(4) the neglect of context which is, in some measure, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. T.F. Torrance's interpretation (Royal Priesthood, Edinburgh, 1955) of the "real meaning" of dabar from "backside" or "hinterground", and its supposed etymological connection with debir, the "backside" (of Tabernacle or Temple), the Holy of Holies; this leads to the construction that the Tabernacle or Temple was built around the significance of dabar, the ten debarim, words or commandments in the debir - all this in spite of the fact that the etymology is quite uncertain and that the connection is nowhere made in the OT and appears to have been unknown to the LXX translators. See on this, Barr, Semantics, p.129ff.



cause of the preceding abuses: the semantics of words in their actual usages is not investigated; their interpretation is taken directly from the dictionary and not from the texts in which they appear, and the question of what the writer meant when he used a particular word is not raised. In contrast to this type of procedure Barr maintains, in what is the only really positive solution to the problem which his book offers, that a "better way to approach biblical language in its relation to theology" will be "at the level of the larger linguistic complexes, such as the sentences".

It is the sentence (and of course the still larger literary complex such as the complete speech or poem) which is the linguistic bearer of the usual theological statement, and not the word (the lexical unit) or the morphological and syntactical connection.

The uniqueness of the religious structure of Israel or of the Christian preaching did not consist primarily (if at all) in the issuing of new words, new word-concepts or of new conceptual content for old words: rather, its newness, says Barr, "consisted in new combinations of words, in which it was often possible for the semantic value of the words to be changed only slightly or not at all, and for the new or distinctive concept to be indicated by the word-combination."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quotations from Semantics, p.263.



The failure to realise that distinctive meaning belongs to the word-combination or sentence (treated in context) rather than to individual words is, in Barr's opinion, the basic misconception underlying the construction of the monumental Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Kittel and Friedrich. In this work, which purports to be a dictionary of Greek words, "external lexicography" i.e. the listing of word-occurrences and meanings, is presupposed or given the briefest treatment, whereas "inner lexicography" or "concept-history", stressing religious, philosophical and theological usage, is emphasised. This, according to Barr, is an improper methodology. Lexicography, if it is to be true to its name, cannot pass from linguistic material to the inner world of thought, without making the false assumption that the word, rather than the word-combination, indicates the concept. The study of the varied semantic value of words in their contexts is subordinated to the search (dictated by the theology of the Heilsgeschichte) for "general concepts" which may be true in general but never fit all cases of particular word-usage. While Barr commends some of the articles in TWNT and observes that it may be better than the principles on which it was planned, he nevertheless feels that the general conception of the whole must be criticised.



Barr has undoubtedly rendered a valuable service to Biblical scholarship by exposing the careless linguistic methods upon which imposing theological statements have been content to rest; nevertheless, his zeal to warn the student of the Bible of the errors into which he may fall has allowed him, perhaps to be over-critical of some authors and to over-simplify some of the issues. It is not our purpose to enter into discussion of all the points raised by his book; its reviewers have already offered a conspectus of scholarly comment and criticism:<sup>1</sup> but there are some issues which we must touch upon, since discussion of them is necessary to the forwarding of the positive approach to the interpretation of Biblical terms in which we are interested.

1. The value of Etymology. No reasonable person will question Barr's claim that the knowledge of the etymology of a word - which is a statement concerning its past history - is not an infallible guide to its present meaning: yet no reasonable person will wish to maintain that the original or etymological meaning of a word (when it is discoverable) cannot, in any circumstances, assist our understanding of

---

<sup>1</sup> Of the published reviews the following seem to me to be the most valuable: B.S. Childs in JBL, LXXX, (Dec.1961) pp.374-377, Th.Boman in TLZ, LXXXVII, (Apr.1962) pp.262-65 and in SJT, XV, (1962) pp.319ff; R.M. Wilson in NTS, VIII, (1962) pp. 282-83; G.E. Wright in Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XVII, (May, 1962) pp.350-53; and L. Alonso-Schökel in Biblica, XLIII, (1962) pp.217-23.



its use. The past history of a word may be valuable in helping us to grasp the fulness of its present meaning and, on occasion, etymology may enable us to understand why the author selected certain words in preference to others in order to express his thoughts. Bad examples of etymologising (and there are many) do not vitiate its careful and correct use. Likewise, while there has been a harmful overworking of the value of "root-meanings", there can be no doubt that there are many words whose present meanings are more clearly understood in the light of the "root-meaning". In short, there is a scientific use of etymology, helpful in the elucidation of the problems of change, loss and addition of meaning.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Context of Meaning. Barr feels that the sentence or larger linguistic complex, and not the word, is the level at which semantic distinctiveness can be settled. But is this a sufficient context for interpretation? It seems to us that Barr minimises the importance of an historical perspective in providing an adequate context of meaning. Each word (and particularly any which was to become significant theologically) came to the Biblical authors with

<sup>1</sup> On the scientific approach to etymology, see S. Ullmann, Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning, (Blackwell of Oxford, 1962) chaps. 4 and 8; also Y. Malkiel, "The Place of Etymology in Linguistic Research", Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXI, (1954) pp.78-90, which contrasts scientific etymology with the bizarre conjectures, based on seductive affinities of meaning, which characterised an earlier era.



its own particular content and associations which they either accepted, modified or rejected: therefore the investigation of its historical and traditional usage is a necessary preliminary to discovering the extent of indebtedness or uniqueness in its use by a writer at a particular time.<sup>1</sup> In this connection, the elucidation of the original, or earliest discoverable, context of meaning (i.e. in the life of ancient Israel or of the early Christian church) will provide valuable assistance in understanding the choice of a word by a writer and the extent of its development up to and within his use.

3. Language Structure and Thought Structure. Throughout Barr's book one is constantly aware of his rejection of the thesis that the basic lineaments of a culture are traceable in the vocabulary, grammar and syntax of a language - a thesis which underlies many attempts to draw distinctions and parallels between the Greek and Hebrew views of life. Barr believes that this whole notion actually rests on an idealist type of philosophy: and with this philosophic standpoint the great exponent of the view that language-structure reflects the peculiar thought of peoples, W. von Humboldt, was certainly identified. The influence of his

<sup>1</sup> On the process of adequate contextualisation, see J.R. Firth, Papers in Linguistics, (Oxford, 1957) ch.3. The most recent, thorough discussion of the importance of context (in its widest sense) for the interpretation of language is Langage et Contexte by T. Slama-Cazacu, (Mouton: The Hague, 1961).



theory is directly present in Th.Boman's work, and indirectly in the writings of many others whom Barr criticises. For the attitude of Barr himself to it we may quote:

In this view (that linguistic structure reflects or corresponds to the thought structure) there are very great difficulties, and though it may be possible to maintain it in some greatly modified sense, the way in which it is at present used in theology may well be regarded as wholly outmoded and a survival from the time before the scientific<sup>1</sup> study of language began.

Although he counsels theologians to state their position on the relation between language and thought-structure, Barr himself does not do so: nor does he state or formulate any philosophy of language as the support of his own semantic theories. However, by his definition of "linguistics" (on page 2, note 1) and in his entire discussion, he excludes the psychological and sociological viewpoints in the science of language, with result that a mechanistic approach dominates, concerned with the laws of language and usage, not with the processes of the mind. But this formalistic branch of semantics (with which Barr identifies himself) is not the only one which merits the name of science.<sup>2</sup> Further-

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit. p.33.

<sup>2</sup> See Ullmann, op.cit., pp.58ff. H. Kronasser's conception of semantics in the Handbuch der Semasiologie (Heidelberg, 1952) to which Barr often refers, has a broader extension than Barr's, including the psychological aspects of meaning, and even criticising the formalistic branch of semantics to which B. belongs, p.61, sect.34. W. Porzig, Das Wunder der Sprache (Bern, 1950 pp.93-108) reveals the advantages and limitations of all the major schools of linguistic thought: no one, by itself, (he claims) is entirely or uniquely valid and right.



more, the philosophic outlook within which it flourishes is that of Positivism,<sup>1</sup> and as Boman and L.Alonso-Schökel have pointed out (in the reviews mentioned), Barr seems prepared to align himself with this standpoint by his rejection of all suggestions of Idealism, and by his (unconscious) reduction of philosophic concepts to matters of logic and of word-usage.

Though not equipped to comment on the relative merits of different philosophies of language, we feel obliged to call attention to four points concerning Barr's views. (1) The Humboldtian theory that linguistic structure reflects thought structure is by no means dead: it forms the basis of a significant school of semantics both in Europe and in America.<sup>2</sup> Consequently no finality attaches to the

<sup>1</sup> Humboldt's philosophy of language (being, in large measure, an application of the Kantian critique of Reason in the linguistic sphere) was ineffective in the second half of the 19th century when a positivist interpretation dominated in the science of language: when philosophical positivism was overcome in Germany by neo-Kantianism, then interest in Humboldt's work revived. Cf. the remark of R.E. Longacre, Language, XXXII, (1956) p.299: "The mechanistic-behaviouristic slant given to descriptive linguistics by Bloomfield has undoubtedly created in some quarters a certain prejudice against anything savouring of idealism, and a predisposition towards logical positivism." Barr himself is aware that the formalistic linguistic method of the late 19th century was a consequence of the prevailing positivistic philosophy, Biblical Words for Time, p.94.

<sup>2</sup> In Europe, Humboldt's ideas are basic to the work of such distinguished linguists as J. Trier and L. Weisgerber, in their exposition of the theory of "semantic fields": see H. Basilius, "Neo-Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics", Word, VIII, 1952, pp.95-105, and S. Öhman, "Theories of the 'Linguistic Field'", Word, IX, 1953, pp.123-34. In America, they underlie



position on which Barr takes his stand: the issues are not yet closed. (2) His predisposition towards a positivist viewpoint will lead to the assumption that "meaning" can be turned into a question of the rules of usage. This would have the most serious consequences for Biblical theology. But, in fact, the meaning of Biblical terms (indeed of all religious language) can be grasped only by penetrating beyond the words and matters of usage to an

the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on the influence of language on thought, for which see B.L. Whorf, Four Articles on Metalinguistics, (Washington, 1952) and Language, Thought and Reality, ed. J.B. Carroll, (New York and M.I.T., 1955). This hypothesis has been developed mainly by anthropologists on the basis of research in American-Indian languages. (Cf. H. Hoijer, "Cultural Implications of some Navaho Linguistic Categories", Language, XXVII, 1951, pp. 111-20.) It has roused considerable interest and has been the subject of searching debate: see Language in Culture, ed. H. Hoijer, (Chicago, 1954) and Language, Thought and Culture, ed. P. Henle (Ann Arbor, 1958) especially chaps. 1 and 2.

Linguists are critical of many of the details of this hypothesis, and not least that it lays too great emphasis on languages which have no historical dimension and give no scope for studying the role of language in the higher reaches of culture and thought: yet they are appreciative of its main principle. In reviewing the Hoijer volume in Romance Philology, X, (1956-57) S. Ullmann says, "It is becoming increasingly clear that there is some kind of reciprocity between language and thought: language not only expresses our thoughts, but, to some extent, conditions and predetermines them: it furnishes the speaker with a ready-made system of categories and scale of values and directs his thinking into certain channels" p. 225. For a statement of modifications in the theory (e.g. that language predisposes to, rather than determines, a certain way of thinking) see J.W. Swanson, "Linguistic Relativity and Translation", Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXII, (Dec. 1961), pp. 185-92. That vocabulary provides some kind of index to cultural emphases seems certain: the issues are more in dispute over grammar and sentence construction: see Henle's contribution to Language, Thought and Culture, pp. 1-24.



understanding of the religious experience or perception of truth which they attempt to express or to which they point.

(3) It is not necessary to take up the linguistic and philosophic viewpoints with which Barr seems to identify himself in order to point out and to avoid the errors of method made by many Biblical theologians. (4) The rejection of the Humboldt-Whorf approach involves the rejection of its corollary, the thesis of "linguistic relativity", i.e. that certain items in the linguistic repertoire of one language are not translatable into some other language without loss or distortion.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, Barr implies (though with some misgiving) that anything can be translated into another language without fundamental loss, if linguistic laws are strictly and carefully followed. We are inclined to doubt this. Because each word has a history and individual development of meaning within a language, the particular area of reality which it articulates (within a particular world-view) may overlap, but will not exactly coincide with that expressed by a word in another language. In this connection, the problem of the relation of many Greek words in the New Testament to their Hebrew counterparts is of fundamental importance.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See on this problem, J.W. Swanson, loc.cit.

<sup>2</sup> For ancient statements regarding the "untranslatability" of Hebrew into Greek, see R.M. Wilson's review of Barr in NTS, VIII, p.282.



4. The Kittel Wörterbuch. One may welcome many of Barr's criticisms of this work: the articles vary in quality, and the whole project has deficiencies, as its second editor admits.<sup>1</sup> However, we cannot see how the conception can be thought invalid on the grounds Barr seems to indicate it is, viz. that a dictionary should not pass from detailed linguistic material to the inner world of thought, to concepts. Can a dictionary (if it is to be helpful towards the total understanding of word-meaning) do other than combine word-history and concept-history? We think it cannot: and the reason is that, while every word is indeed a semantic marker, various words and combinations of words in a particular culture and in a particular context will have adhering to them and around them a field of meaning which the interpreter must attempt to penetrate. This is especially true of terms which are theologically significant. It is therefore true that a dictionary should start at a linguistic point with an adequate word-history, but it cannot claim to have completed its task until it attempts

<sup>1</sup> G. Friedrich, "Die Problematik eines theologischen Wörterbuchs zum NT", Studia Evangelica (ed. K. Aland, Berlin, 1959) pp. 483ff. The article ends: "Fundamentally the attempt to construct a theological word-book of the NT has been undertaken too early, for the presuppositions for such a work in the sphere of classical philology, in OT theology, in the study of the LXX and of Judaism, have not been determined. We have indeed good editors of the texts, but not the corresponding lexicons to illumine the specific character of a particular word in a particular period. Hence the word-book is not a summary of what has already been worked out or the conclusion of a development, it is only an attempt."



to enter the field of meaning for which the word is a semantic marker. Semantics is surely concerned with something more than the non-theological when it tries to explicate theological terms and contexts. Where else but in a theological word-book (as the book avowedly is) would one expect to find pointed out and discussed the semantic variations which accompany the appearance of a word within different contexts and situations of thought? It is our opinion that it is the use made of, and the authority attributed to the TWNT by scholars which is at fault, rather than the work itself.

5. The Language of the New Testament. Consistently with his general theory, Barr maintains that the impress of the Hebraic-Old Testament background on the New Testament is to be found at the level of the things which the various authors said and not of the words they used to say them. These words often retained the same semantic value as they normally had in the usage of Hellenistic speakers, and this value was not greatly deepened even when words were technically overprinted with a Jewish reference.<sup>1</sup> We do not find this position adequate. Apart altogether from meaning, the structure and syntax of NT Greek bear the impress of a special Hebraic influence channelled for the most part through the Septuagint. Because of the importance of this point, it seems proper to devote some attention to it.

<sup>1</sup> Semantics, p.250.



## THE NATURE OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

The recent study by Nigel Turner entitled "The Language of the New Testament"<sup>1</sup> will offer an important point of reference for future discussion of this theme and provides the foundation for this brief statement.

It is generally agreed among scholars that the language of the New Testament writers belongs to what is known as Koine (Greek), a kind of average Greek in which many dialects shared (though Attic was the foundation), and which developed with the spread of Hellenistic Greek culture to become the "common language" of the whole Mediterranean world. It was not, however, with the rather artificial language found in the literature of this period that most of the NT writings revealed affinities, but with its colloquial forms, and especially with the language of the non-literary papyri, ostraca and inscriptions discovered in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> This language was vigorous and fresh, but lacked much of the subtlety of classical Greek: it was characterised

<sup>1</sup> Peake's Commentary, ed. Black and Rowley, (Nelson, 1962) pp. 652-662. Other valuable studies are "An Introduction to the Lexicon of the Greek NT" in A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT, ed. W. Bauer, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago and CUP, 1957) pp. ix-xxv; B. M. Metzger, "The Language of the NT" in The Interpreter's Bible (Nashville, 1961-67) vol. 7, pp. 43-59; and E. C. Colwell, "The Greek Language" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, (Nashville, 1962) vol. 2, pp. 479-87. Full bibliographies are given with these studies.

<sup>2</sup> The chief exponents of this view were A. Deissmann, Grenfell and Hunt, and rather less firmly J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, in Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, (London, 1914-29).



by a simplicity of the verb-system, simpler syntax, an increasing frequency of prepositions and compound verbs and by a tendency to disregard the rules of concord. Here it seemed was a type of Greek which was almost exactly that of the New Testament. Modification of this view has taken place over the years, in the direction of stressing the likeness between the language of some NT authors and that of literary Hellenistic Greek;<sup>1</sup> and recently E.K. Simpson has studied a number of significant NT words on which the papyri shed no light at all, but which receive clarification from their usage in literary Hellenistic texts.<sup>2</sup> But even this more balanced view has left many scholars dissatisfied, and another approach to the problem of the nature of NT Greek has been taking shape.

Beginning from the realisation that the New Testament is religious literature, this approach seeks illumination on its language from the only extensive religious work written in Koine, the 3rd century B.C. Greek translation of the Old Testament scriptures, commonly called the Septuagint (LXX). The very fact that many of the quotations from the OT found in the New are from this version, and not from the Hebrew, proves that this Greek

1 Cf. G. Milligan's final preface (1929) to the famous Vocabulary of the Greek NT.

2 Words Worth Weighing in the Greek New Testament, (London: Tyndale Press, 1945).



version (or versions) was familiar to and influenced at least some of the early Christian writers. But the extent of the influence is not limited to quotations. Because the same general themes characterise both Testaments, the vocabularies have a great measure of similarity: and research into the syntax of the Greek of the OT has revealed its remarkable likeness to that of the NT.<sup>1</sup> On account of these similarities, the emphasis in investigation has been directed more and more towards the character of LXX Greek. On the basis of his researches in this field H.S. Gehman claims that, while the Greek of the OT is undoubtedly Koine, it differs in many ways from other Koine Greek in having a distinctive Hebraic cast.<sup>2</sup> This Hebraic influence and character is demonstrable at the level of idiom and of syntax (in the use of conjunctions, prepositions and pronouns, and in the frequency of the optative mood) and of vocabulary;<sup>3</sup> "certain Greek words had to be adapted to OT

1 Cf. W. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek", VT, V, (1955) pp. 208-13. One is constantly aware of the lack of a full study of the syntax of the Greek OT, though Gehman's work (see below) is helpful: Thackeray's volume on syntax was never written. On NT Greek syntax we now have Turner's volume, completing Moulton's Grammar of NT Greek, (E'burgh, 1963) and A Greek Grammar of the New Testament (Blass and Debrunner, trans. R.W. Funk: Chicago and CUP, 1961).

2 Gehman, "The Hebraic Character of LXX Greek", VT, I, (1951) pp. 81-90.

3 Gehman, VT, IV, (1954) pp. 337-48 shows that the word "holy" (ἅγιος) can be understood in the Greek OT on some occasions only if one is conversant with the Hebrew text. For the importance of the study of the LXX and the underlying



usage and in this way they received a meaning not found in classical or ordinary Hellenistic Greek."<sup>1</sup> Gehman admits that many of the Semitic idioms in LXX Greek may be due to a literalistic rendering of the Hebrew, but goes on to suggest that if the translation actually made sense to Hellenistic Jews (as one expects), it was because it corresponded to an already familiar way of expression: therefore he is prepared to posit the existence of a special Greek with a pronounced Semitic cast used and understood in religious circles - a Jewish-Greek which may still have been current among Jews in New Testament times.<sup>2</sup> It is in terms of this Jewish-Greek, as a probable vernacular and as it finds literary expression in the LXX, that we should understand the language of the New Testament.

It is not our concern here to discuss the relation of this hypothesis to the question of Aramaic sources for the Gospels,<sup>3</sup> but we are concerned to affirm that the language

Hebrew for determining the meaning of certain NT words, see C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, (London, 1935) part 1.

1 Gehman, VT, I, (1951) p.87.

2 Gehman loc.cit. and Turner in New Peake, p.660. In the introduction to the new volume on Syntax in Moulton's Grammar, Turner discusses the Semitic character of Biblical and NT Greek. He raises the question (without giving a definite answer) whether NT Greek is in fact "a spoken Jewish Greek", the kind of Greek presumably used by the inhabitants of middle Palestine, whose own language was Semitic and whose spoken Greek would be shaped by the pattern of their own native tongue.

3 On this problem, see M.Black, Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, (2nd ed.OUP, 1954). The Greek of the books



of the New Testament, apart altogether from the source materials, reveals in its syntax<sup>1</sup> and (more important for our work) in its vocabulary a strong Semitic cast, due in large measure to its indebtedness to the Jewish-Biblical Greek of the Septuagint. The studies which form the main part of this thesis are, to some extent, both the test and the proof of this affirmation.

The relevance of the foregoing discussion and of its conclusions to these word-studies will become evident as we attempt to set forth the guiding principles on which they are based. To that endeavour we now turn.

#### THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE WORD-STUDIES

The studies in this thesis are directed towards determining the meaning of certain important New Testament words; not the meaning which they may have (when translated and interpreted) for us today, but the meaning they had for those who used them in the writings which are preserved for us in the New Testament. Absolute certainty on this is admittedly impossible to obtain, but nevertheless, the attempt to establish it must be continued if we are to begin to understand the message of Scripture, and it must proceed by with Aramaic sources lying behind them will reveal the Semitic character to an especial degree.

1 Cf. K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Band 1, Teil 1: Satzlehre, (Göttingen, 1962).



using none but worthy methods, both linguistic and exegetical. Let us now indicate what seem to be the most important among such methods.

1. We must pay a proper respect to the immediate context in which a word appears. By immediate context we mean the sentence in which the word occurs, and the larger surrounding literary complex, the paragraph or pericope.<sup>1</sup> This must be kept in mind when dealing with each separate occurrence of the word lest we miss any new development in its semantic value or erroneously read into it a meaning belonging to another occurrence or another author; the latter being what Barr calls "illegitimate totality transfer".<sup>2</sup>

2. Advancing upon this first principle, we must pay regard to what we will call "historical context". This involves the realisation that each of the theological terms discussed possessed special content and associations which it had developed in the course of its history: these the Biblical authors either accepted, modified or rejected. If they pursued either of the latter two courses, then the investigation of the word's historical usage is essential to discovering the extent of the uniqueness of its meaning in their work: if they accepted the content which the word

---

1 See our approach to δίκαιος etc. in the Synoptic Gospels.

2 Semantics, p.218.



possessed at the time of their writing or that which belonged to it at some earlier stage of its development, then the study of historical use is necessary to discovering the place and measure of their indebtedness. For this reason, no study of a word in New Testament Greek is adequate without investigation of its use and meaning in the literature of Classical Greek and of the later pre-NT Greek, especially the Septuagint.

Within this process of contextualisation in history we would include the attempt to ascertain the original or earliest-discoverable life-situation within which a word was used and possessed meaning: in our cases, this will be found in the institutions and thought of ancient Israel or in some aspect of the life and experience of the early Christian church. This search may be assisted by a scientific approach to etymology: it may also shed light on the reasons for the choice of a particular word by an author: and it will provide a point of reference for the tracing of semantic development. The influence of this method underlies our attempt to locate the situation or thought-reference within which our terms (especially the Hebrew words) originated,<sup>1</sup> and thereafter to pursue as far as possible a chronological study.

<sup>1</sup> This has proved to be of significance in the case of  $\pi\tau\chi$  and  $\delta\chi\lambda / \pi\tau\sigma$ , which are the common Hebrew equivalents of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta$  and  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\nu$  respectively.



3. From what has already been said, it is clear that the discussion of the semantics of NT words and word-families requires us to deal with the meaning of their OT Hebrew equivalents. Our earlier statement and conclusions on the nature of NT Greek provide the justification for such a procedure. That language is a special kind of Jewish-Biblical Greek both in its syntax and in the thought-forms it expresses, and the LXX translation plays a very significant role in locating for us the area of Hebrew meaning which has contributed to the value of NT words. Consequently in our studies we have given a section to the examination of the LXX translators' use of the term which we discuss. In doing so we have found it profitable (especially in the  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\nu$  complex) to find out and discuss not only the usual Hebrew equivalent but also any other Hebrew words which are rendered by our Greek term, as well as any other Greek words used to translate the main Hebrew equivalent. In this way we extend our knowledge of the translators' understanding of both the Greek words they used and the Hebrew terms which formed their background.<sup>1</sup>

4. We cannot, however, assume that the Old Testament provides the only source of Jewish influence on the thought

<sup>1</sup> Great care must be exercised in assessing the significance of the unusual translations of the Hebrew words. In the discussion of the  $\text{ἰλᾱσκεσθαι}$  words C.H. Dodd has allowed the unusual translation to dictate the meaning of the whole complex: see below p. 371.



and language of the NT. It may be, and in fact, in our opinion, is the main source: but we must remember that the Hebrew terms there had their own development of meaning, and their later significance may have contributed to, or at least may illumine, NT usage. For this reason we have included a study of the various relevant Hebrew terms in the Qumran literature, which is the source for our understanding one strand of Jewish thought immediately prior to and during the birth of Christianity. We have also added surveys of the Rabbinic teaching on the various themes. The probable relevance of this teaching for the understanding of the NT has already been disclosed by such writers as W.D. Davies and David Daube. Extreme caution is required in postulating Rabbinic influence in the NT because of the uncertainty in dating the various traditions: but in this work we have not tried to indicate precise areas of dependence, rather, we have sought to suggest the state of Jewish thinking, or, more correctly, the directions in which it was moving in relation to the themes we discuss, which directions the New Testament writers might share or reject.

5. Because of the Hebraic ideas associated with the Greek vocabulary of the NT writers, we must reckon with the possibility that, while these ideas communicated themselves to Jewish minds, they may not have registered with Gentile



hearers, who would understand the words in their normal Hellenistic sense.<sup>1</sup> This difference between the meaning intended and the meaning taken may often be exaggerated: we must remember that the words were heard (or read), even by Gentiles, not in isolation, but in a context within which, even to them, the Jewish meaning was probably suggested. This is certainly the case with such a dominant theological term as δικαιοσύνη : but it may not have been so with a word like λύτρον . However, it must be affirmed that our concern is with the meaning given to terms by the authors, not with the interpretation or misinterpretation they received by readers.

6. In view of Barr's criticisms of the TWNT, the apparent likeness of our word-studies to those contained in that work requires explanation. In the first place, we reiterate our opinion that, while every word is indeed a semantic marker, the task of understanding the word requires us to penetrate the area or field of meaning for which it is a marker or to which it points. The understanding of theological terms - as part of religious language which has its own symbolical and experience-governed character - cannot be based solely on linguistic matters and rules of usage: in order to be adequate it must seek to enter into the

<sup>1</sup> Bauer-Arndt and Gingrich, op.cit., preface p.xxi reminds us of this possibility.



territory of meaning towards which the words point, as expressions of men's thought, faith and experience. Though there is this considerable agreement with TWNT in fundamental approach, we hope that we may fairly claim to have avoided the errors of practice which characterise some of its articles. We have tried throughout to allow context its rightful place in matters of interpretation: to discuss, even if the degree of detail differs, all the occasions on which a word appears, and not only those which will fit a neat pattern or theological scheme. We have sought to avoid a false emphasis on etymology as well as the error of interpreting a word primarily from its most pregnant sense: and we have tried not to allow theological presuppositions to dominate exegesis. Moreover, by treating the data historically, we have permitted (as not all the TWNT articles do) each Biblical writer his own voice, without attempting to assemble them into a harmonising chorus. The danger of a too great concern for theological synthesis is that some aspects of meaning which, though significant, do not conform are totally neglected or inadequately presented. Finally, we have not allowed the oft-made distinction between Greek and Hebrew thinking to obtrude itself unnecessarily upon our arguments or to prejudice our use of evidence.

In short, we hope that our work is not open to the criticism of being "a series of theological essays on the



doctrines associated at certain points with the words studied".<sup>1</sup> We have not set out to write theology, not even Biblical theology: we are investigating words and their meanings, the understanding of which must form a necessary preliminary to the adequate statement of Biblical theology or theologies. Our task is descriptive, not dogmatic;<sup>2</sup> it is with great cost to both undertakings that they have been too readily combined in some recent work.

#### THE SELECTION OF WORDS FOR STUDY

A study which is concerned with methods of approach to a certain task must limit the illustrative material presented. We have selected a number of words from the vocabulary of New Testament soteriology. The choice was not made with any presuppositions as to the extent of their indebtedness to either Greek or Hebrew thought, but rather in an attempt to represent the variety of the New Testament expression and understanding of one theme. The terms ἱλαστυριον and

1 This is Barr's verdict on TWNT, Semantics, p.262.

2 On this theme see the series of articles on Biblical Hermeneutics in JBL, LXXVII (1958) and especially that by Krister Stendahl, "Implications of Form-criticism and Tradition-criticism for Biblical Interpretation". In this he says, "... The task of Biblical studies, even of Biblical theology, is to describe, to relive and relate, in the terms and presuppositions of the period of the texts, what they meant to their authors and their contemporaries" (p.38); but the task of relating this to the present belongs (according to Stendahl) to systematic theology and the principles of how to do it are called "hermeneutics" (p.38).



Λύτρον reveal two understandings of the place of Christ and of his death in bringing about the possibility of salvation. The study of δικαιοσύνη discloses the Pauline understanding of the nature of the salvation procured and the character of the "saved" life. The use of ζῶν δίκαιος is discussed because, to a considerable extent, it represents John's equivalent of Paul's δικαιοσύνη. We end with the examination of the word πνεῦμα, which, within the complexity of its meanings, expresses the New Testament understanding of the power of God in the life of Jesus and in the life of his followers.

This selection will make possible, we believe, the fulfilment of our aim - to illumine some aspects of a significant NT theme and to illustrate the distinctive ways of expressing its meaning which are characteristic of different NT writers. Only as this discipline is rigorously pursued and its scope extended do we have the necessary preparation for making any valid statement in Biblical theology.



THE INTERPRETATION OF ἰλάσκεσθαι AND RELATED WORDS  
in the Septuagint and in the New Testament  
with special reference to Romans 3:25.

	Page
The Septuagint Usage and its Hebrew Background	32
The New Testament Usage	54
Romans 3:25	59



The terms "propitiation" and "expiation" are so closely related that they are often regarded as interchangeable in religious contexts. This is due also to the fact that when (as is often the case) interest is centred on the means by which "expiation" or "propitiation" is achieved, no difference in the actions involved can be discovered. Nevertheless, it is of some importance that the distinction between the meanings of the two words should be made. It is a distinction which lies in the realm of thought and intention. "Propitiation" is primarily and directly orientated towards the deity or offended person. The purpose which underlies it is that of making the deity favourable, of causing his attitude to be changed from anger and displeasure to good-will and favour. Presumably there may also be included within the idea of propitiation (though in a somewhat weakened sense) such action as is designed to maintain the favourable inclination, after conciliation of wrath has been effected. "Expiation" is also concerned with the relations of the subject of the action with the deity or person, but here the initial thought is less directly and immediately oriented towards the deity. There is an intermediate concern. Expiation is directed towards that which has caused the break-down in relationship; it deals with sin and guilt; it is concerned with the performance of compensatory rites or with making reparation in some



way for the offence.<sup>1</sup> By dealing with the cause of displeasure (often at the command of the offended party) the subject of the expiatory action is made more acceptable and the way is opened for the restoration of good relations.

Since, as we have said, this distinction is not always (indeed not often) apparent from the actual action carried out, it follows that, if we are to draw it with reference to a specific occasion or act, we must try to penetrate to the motive which prompted and the purpose which carried through the action. We must try to detect, either from the context or from our understanding of the situation itself in so far as we can enter into it, whether on the one hand it was to deal with sins, to make adequate reparation for the wrong done so that reconciliation might proceed, or whether on the other hand, the primary concern was to appease wrath by direct means, to render and retain the deity favourably-inclined. Considerations of a purely grammatical kind (e.g. the voice of verbs, the cases which follow verbs and the nature of their objects, i.e. thing or person) may be guides to interpretation, but they do not exhaust the evidence which must be taken into account. The fact that C.H. Dodd limits his discussion of ἰλάσκεσθαι etc. in the LXX to matters of grammatical usage and trans-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Barr, HDB, (new ed. Edinburgh, 1963) p.810, "The difference is in the directing of the verbal action towards a person or an offence".



lation equivalence partly explains its inadequacy.<sup>1</sup> This we hope to show in the following sections.

It is generally agreed that, in the overwhelming majority of those passages in pagan writers where ἱλάσκεσθαι and its cognates are used, the word means "propitiation" or "appeasement".<sup>2</sup> Dodd admits this, but claims that LXX usage is so completely different that practically no vestige of this meaning remains. "Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the Deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin."<sup>3</sup> In so far as Dodd is concerned to prove that ideas of celestial bribery and of capricious, vindictive anger on the part of Yahweh are absent from the Old Testament, his work commands grateful agreement. Nevertheless, this must not be taken to mean that all ideas of divine wrath are foreign to the Old Testament. In actual fact the idea of the "wrath of God" is

<sup>1</sup> The discussion referred to is in JTS, XXXII (1931) pp.352-360. It was reprinted without alteration in The Bible and The Greeks, (London, 1935) pp.82-95. We quote from the former.

<sup>2</sup> The use of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι to mean "expiate" is probable in the late Men Tyrannus inscription (Ditt.Syll.3rd ed.1042). The context of Plato Leg.862c suggests (pace Dodd) that the verb is used to mean "propitiate": so Buchsel, ThNT, vol.3, p.317. According to Moulton and Milligan, VGT, (London, 1929) sub ἱλάσκομαι, the word group in Hellenistic Greek, as in Classical, refers to "placating". They interpret ἱλάσκομαι as "render propitious to oneself" with acc. of the person, and go on to note "a similar use of the compound ἐξιλάσκομαι, which extends to the LXX".

<sup>3</sup> Dodd, JTS, XXXII, p.359.



very deeply embedded there, but it is a responsible anger, a holy reaction caused only, but inevitably, by sin and wrong-doing. That this thought is present in many, if not all, of those passages in which the LXX uses ἰλάσκειθαι and related words is the thesis of Leon Morris' study of the term in The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross.<sup>1</sup> He claims that

the averting of anger seems to represent a stubborn substratum of meaning from which all the usages can be naturally explained, even those with God as subject, for while the OT is emphatic about the reality and seriousness of the wrath of God, the removal of that wrath is due in the last resort to God himself. 2

Although on some occasions Morris' exegesis appears to be forced in order to comply with his thesis,<sup>3</sup> it seems that, in general, he has convincingly demonstrated the truth of his claim. In the majority of cases where ἰλάσκειθαι and related words appear, the context contains clear reference to the anger of God: many, in fact, express the desire that God should turn from his wrath,<sup>4</sup> thus demonstrating that the terms are related to the purpose of rendering God favourable. The fact that Dodd has omitted all discussion of contexts from his study has meant neglect of this element in interpretation.

1 London, 1955.

2 Morris, op.cit., p.155.

3 E.g. his view that divine wrath is expressed in 2 Kings 5:18, Ps. 25:11 and 65:3 is based on wholly subjective criteria: in the second and third of these instances it depends on the author's judgment as to what may constitute signs of the wrath of God.

4 E.g. Ex.32:12 and Dan.9:16.



This, however, is not the only criticism which may be made of Dodd's article. His first main point is as follows:

Where the LXX translators do not render  $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  and its derivatives by words of the  $\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  class, they render it by words which give the meaning "to sanctify", "purify" persons or objects of ritual, or "to cancel", "purge away", "forgive" sins. We should therefore expect to find that they regard the  $\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  class as conveying similar ideas. 1

Three observations on this argument seem pertinent. (i) The meanings of the words translating  $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (other than  $\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ) vary so greatly (between "sanctify" and "cancel") that they cannot offer a precise guide to the meaning of the  $\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  group. (ii) The method of argumentation is itself open to dangers. It may be true that  $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  mean nearly the same thing; but it does not necessarily follow that every other Hebrew word rendered by  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is closely related in meaning to  $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , or that every other Greek word which translates  $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  must bear a similar significance to  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  etc. Considerations of context must be given their proper place in every interpretation. Moreover, some aspects of meaning which belong to the semantic breadth of a term may require translation by a word significantly different from that used to render the main sense of the term. At most, translation variants (if they possess a single theme of meaning) may provide a guide to the sense

1 Op.cit., p.353.



of the regular translation terms. (iii) From the arrangement of his material, Dodd would appear to be making the meaning of translation-variants the basis on which to build the meaning of the regular translation word ἐξίλασκεισθαι . It would be more satisfactory if the meaning of the latter had been established first and confirmation then sought from the variant translations.

The second point in Dodd's article is that, in almost all cases where ἰλάσκεσθαι etc. do not render רָצַח and its derivatives, "they render words which fall into one or other of two classes: (i) with human subject, "to cleanse from sin or defilement", 'to expiate'; (ii) with divine subject, 'to be gracious', 'to have mercy', 'to forgive'".<sup>1</sup> Hence it is implied that the meaning of ἰλάσκεσθαι , both here and generally, is not "propitiate". As well as being exposed to the second and the third of the criticisms listed above, this section seems to be dominated by the assumption that if we know or can discover the meaning of a Hebrew word, then we know the exact meaning of the Greek word which renders it in the LXX. But is translation a process of mechanically inserting equivalents? We are in search of the meaning of the Greek words of the ἰλάσκεσθαι class: the Hebrew words they render in the LXX are always important guides to this meaning, but they

I Op.cit., p.356.



are not the only factor to be considered in finding it. The LXX translators may have had good reasons for using words of this group even when they seem to us to be strange renderings of the Hebrew. The ideas expressed in the context, rather than the single Hebrew term, may have influenced their method of translation. For instance, why was

נָבִיחַ נִיחַ נִיחַ-חֲבִי at 2 Kings 24:4 translated οὐκ ἠθέλησεν Κύριος ἰλασθῆναι, when נָבִיחַ could have been rendered adequately and more simply by ἀφιέναι or ἀφαιρεῖν ?

The context here (also at Dan.9:19 and Lam.3:42, where the construction is similar) undoubtedly implies the divine wrath and therefore suggests the idea of propitiation: it may be that the passive of the verb is an attempt to express this theme. The same may be said of Ex.32:14 where

נִיחַ נִיחַ ("the Lord repented") is rendered by καὶ ἰλάσθη Κύριος . By the intercession of Moses (not by sacrifice) the fierceness of the divine wrath (v.12) was turned away from Israel, and that is surely the propitiatory theme.

Despite the Hebrew, the LXX again demonstrates the character of the context as propitiatory by rendering נִיחַ by ἰλάσθη, a word to which the propitiatory idea belonged. There are cases, however, in which uncertainty does not prevail. When ἐξιλάσκεσθαι (with human subject and God as object) translates נִיחַ, a verb meaning "appease" or "pacify", both context and language show that the notion of



propitiation is being expressed by the Greek verb. This occurs three times, Zech.7:2,8:22 and Mal.1:9, and Dodd admits that they are "unmistakable examples of the ordinary classical and Hellenistic sense of ἐξιλάσκεισθαι "propitiate".<sup>1</sup> But he will not allow them to alter his thesis. He explains (or explains away) their presence by the argument that contemptuous tones or permitted pagan usage in the passage allows the words to be used in this exceptional sense. It is significant that no commentator on these passages and no other discussion of the words in question finds it necessary to put forward any such apology for their presence. Quite obviously, the Hebrew word (usually rendered by δειῖσθαι ), the grammatical construction and the context, all suggest the thought of "propitiation" and this is conveyed by the use of ἐξιλάσκεισθαι.

More interesting is the single occasion (Ps. 106: 30) where ἐξιλάσκεισθαι renders שָׁחַח, a verb which means "pray" or "intercede". The incident referred to in the Psalm is described in Num.25 and Dodd acknowledges that that story is "one of propitiation in the crudest sense".<sup>2</sup> He suggests that it is possible that the translator had the Numbers passage in mind ( שָׁחַח appears at Num.25:13) and that he meant us to understand, "Phineas stood up and placated (the Lord)": but he does not in fact think that

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.355

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.



this is the case, and adds ". . it would be a curiosity of translation if a sense of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι , which is elsewhere carefully avoided . . were gratuitously introduced in this single passage, where there is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it."<sup>1</sup> Can the matter be disposed of so easily? In the first place, although there is nothing in the verb כִּפָּר to suggest "propitiation", we must reckon with the possibility that the LXX translator may have had a reason for introducing the idea. Secondly, is this sense of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι so carefully avoided elsewhere and introduced only here? What about the three passages, Zech.7:2, 8:22 and Mal.1:9? Thirdly, the fact that כִּפָּר is rendered by ἐξιλάσατο and not by one of the usual terms εὐχέσθαι , προσεύχέσθαι , seems to be best accounted for by the suggestion that the translator of the Psalm had the Numbers passage in mind or knew its content - a passage which Dodd admits to be propitiatory in character. Furthermore, from this acknowledged "propitiatory" narrative Dodd quotes v.11 but nowhere does he mention v.13 which speaks thus of Phineas, ἐξηλάωσεν τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ , the Hebrew being כִּפָּר and ἐξιλάσατο being used without an object, as in Ps.106:30. On Dodd's own admission, therefore, ἐξιλάσατο bears the meaning "propitiate" or "make propitiation" in Num.25:13; the same is true, we submit, at Ps.106:30 and

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.356.



also in Ecclus.45:13 where the incident of Phineas is again referred to in the words ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ .

On one occasion, ISam.6:3, the LXX has ἐξίλασ-  
θήσεται where the Hebrew has  $\text{וַיִּשָּׁלַח}$ . Perhaps this translation rests on a misunderstanding of the Hebrew or on a different (now lost) reading, but does it shed no light on the meaning of the Greek word, as both Dodd and Morris claim? The sentence, as it stands, in Greek is coherent and makes good sense. The context is as follows: the Philistines have been smitten with plague because the Ark of God is in their midst; they want to send it back, but their diviners warn them that they should not send it back empty, but with a guilt-offering, for then (they say) "You will be healed, and (M.T.) it will be known to you why his hand does not turn away from you". The Greek renders "You will be healed καὶ ἐξίλασθήσεται ὑμῖν μὴ οὐκ ἀποστῇ ἡ χεὶρ ἀφ' ὑμῶν." Since the immediate object of the Philistines' concern is the getting rid of the plague (the manifestation of divine displeasure) it would seem that the thought of propitiating a deity is present in their minds. This is corroborated by v.5 which interprets the offering as ". . . giving glory to the God of Israel in the hope that he will lighten his hand from off you.." It seems to us that the Greek has taken up the propitiatory significance of the action and expressed it in their rendering, which (we submit) may be



translated ". . and propitiation will be made for you lest his hand turn not away from you".

The occurrence of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι as the translation of □ψχ at Hab.1:11 is of some interest.<sup>1</sup> The passage is very difficult to construe and various emendations of □ψχ have been proposed. Since the discovery of the Qumran Habakkuk commentary it is certain that the most satisfactory of these is the reading □ψ'ן, though the mention of (ן)□ψχ ן'ן in the Pesher (Col.4.10-11) seems to imply acquaintance with the reading □ψχ'ן. Now this latter reading ( □ψχ'ן ) may have been in the text very early, and the LXX translators (if they found it) were in difficulties about its interpretation. One possible reason for their interpreting it as they did (ἐξιλάσεται ) may be offered. The fact that the word belonged to the realm of guilt and guilt-offerings may have suggested the practice (witnessed to in Num.31) of purification for an unclean army. At Num.31:50 ַךְךְ is used of this ritual and the LXX renders it as usual by ἐξιλάσκεσθαι . What kind of practice was this? in the Numbers passage it was not expiatory for sins, because the slaughter of the Midianites took place

<sup>1</sup> At Amos 8:14 we find - "those who swear by ן□ψχ of Samaria". This means either a Samaritan goddess (cf. 2 Kings 17:30) or the guilt and sin of worshipping the calf at Bethel (cf. Hos. 10:8). The LXX renders οἱ ὀμνύοντες κατὰ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ Σαμαρ., which R.S.Cripps, Commentary on Amos, (London, 1929) p.316 interprets, "By propitiation of Samaria".



at the command of God: rather it was the giving of tribute to God as a thank-offering, but also as a means of maintaining the divine favour towards Israel and her armies. Consequently the offering may be regarded as in some sense propitiatory.<sup>1</sup> If recollection of this practice influenced the LXX translation in its rendering of Hab. 1:11, then the word ἐξιλάσκεσθαι (used absolutely) may bear the meaning "carry out propitiatory rites". This, however, is hypothetical: the passage is uncertain.

On the basis of our investigation of those occasions on which the ἱλάσκεσθαι words do not render 793 and its derivatives, it would seem that Dodd's claim that there is in them no notion of propitiation requires revision. He arrives at this conclusion by faulty semantic investigation. In the case of Ps. 106:30 (and Num. 25) he does not notice what is in contradiction to his thesis. He underestimates the clear evidence of Zech. 7:2, 8:22 and Mal. 1:9. In understanding the unexpected appearances of the Greek word, we must not be governed always and solely by the meaning of the Hebrew word which lies behind the translation. The theme of a context may offer guidance on its true interpretation. In any case, we should consider the Greek as worthy of investigation in its own right, and therefore explore possible reasons for which, and possible meanings with which, the LXX translators used this particular word.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G.B. Gray, Numbers, (ICC, Edinburgh, 1903), ad loc.



We turn now to the usual words rendered by our terms. In 83 out of the 105 occasions where it is used in the LXX ἐξιλάσκεσθαι renders כפר and other Hebrew roots only 11 times. This fact shows that the translators regarded the two words as very closely related in meaning. Dodd examines this translation of כפר and concludes: ". . the LXX translators did not regard כפר (when used as a religious term) as conveying the sense of propitiating the deity, but the sense of performing an act whereby guilt or defilement is removed".<sup>1</sup> The consistency with which ἐξιλάσκεσθαι renders כפר justifies some investigation of that word in the OT, and to that we now turn, with the expectation that it will provide significant guidance on the meaning of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι.<sup>2</sup>

Much controversy has raged through the years about the essential meaning of the root כפר. The main division has been between those who advocate the view that it means "to cover" (Arab. kaphara) and those who claim that the original significance is "to wipe away" (Babyl. kuppuru). Investigations into this matter are interesting and of value, but there are two reasons why we

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p.359.

<sup>2</sup> This is not in conflict with our earlier criticism of Dodd for interpreting solely from the Hebrew. In doing so he failed to do justice to the unexpectedness of some appearances of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι. Here it is a matter of doing justice to a consistent practice in the translation.



do not stop here to review the literature and opinions on this question. First, on the general level, it is easy to overestimate the importance of etymology and to assume that once the root-idea has been discovered it may be applied fully in almost any context in which the word appears. This is to ignore the semantic principle that words, in the course of time, change in meaning through being conventionalised and formalised, as well as through being applied to new situations. When we are seeking to establish the meaning of a word, knowledge of its root-value may be helpful, but it is the usage which is ultimately decisive.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, and with particular reference to the root 793, the significant difference between the two root-meanings suggested is not great, and both ideas may well be present to the word. Moreover, the establishment of the root-meaning does not materially assist us in understanding the motive for the action, i.e. whether it was expiatory or propitiatory. While it is true that the meaning "cover" would most naturally refer to the covering of the face of the angry or wronged person (i.e. propitiation), it could also connote the covering of the sin, in the sense of making it without further effect on

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G.F. Moore (Enc. Bib. Vol. 4, col. 4220) "By a fault of method which has been fruitful of error in the study of the OT, the investigation has frequently set out from etymological assumptions instead of from the plain facts of usage." See also J. Barr's strictures on this method in The Semantics of Biblical Language, chapter 6.



the person who committed the fault or on the wronged person (i.e. expiation). On the other hand, if "wipe away" or "remove"<sup>1</sup> is the original significance, this too may mean the removal of wrath (propitiation) or of the cause of wrath, the sin<sup>2</sup> (expiation).

The usage of 79D in the OT divides naturally into two sections according as atonement is viewed as coming by cultic action or by non-cultic means. By far the most common is the use in connection with the cult, but the other group is logically of greater significance for our purpose, since it enables us to see what the verb meant in ordinary usage and to arrive at that idea which made it specially fitted for use in connection with the cult. For it does seem probable, as Morris suggests,<sup>3</sup> that in the case of 79D a word familiar in connection with ordinary affairs was adapted to, and its meaning conventionalised within, cultic use. That the non-cultic use is fundamental was noticed by S.H. Langdon, who said, "Before examining the Hebrew cult term it will be much more logical to examine those passages in which the word is not used in rituals."<sup>4</sup> More recently, Herrmann has adopted this procedure,<sup>5</sup> but

<sup>1</sup> S.H. Langdon, ET, XXII (1910-11) p.381. In recent years the interpretation "wipe", "wipe clean" has been gaining acceptance: see G.R. Driver, JTS, XXXIV, (1933) pp.34ff.

<sup>2</sup> With Th. Vriksen, Outline of OT Theology (Oxford, 1958) p.287.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., p. 142.

<sup>4</sup> ET, XXII (1910-11) p.323.

<sup>5</sup> TWNT, Vol.3 p.302.







it by ἐξιλάσωμαι : the turning away of the divine wrath at any cost, even that of his own life, is Moses' concern, as well as the offering of an equivalent to make amends for the people's sin. An instructive example for the understanding of 793 is 2Sam,21:1-14, a passage which concerns a famine in Israel, the cause of which is traced to Saul's treatment of the Gibeonites. David asks them, "What shall I do for you? Wherewith shall I make atonement?"

793, 793 (LXX ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσωμαι ; ) that you may bless the heritage of the Lord" (v.3) Eventually, seven descendants of Saul were delivered to be hanged. Once more, the idea of propitiating anger seems strong in the passage: the favour of the Gibeonites had to be won, even at the price of the destruction of life.

Leon Morris examines the entire non-cultic use of 793 and affirms that the idea of providing a "ransom" ( 793 ) in money or in life in order to turn away wrath is so strongly present in it that the verb should be interpreted as a denominative, i.e. "to give or pay a kopher".<sup>1</sup> Some of his arguments may be rather forced (e.g. on Ps.65:3 and Dan.9:24) but adequate grounds are given for doubting the legitimacy of the claim that all ideas of propitiating wrath are absent from 793 and from ἐξιλάσκεισθαι which so frequently translates it. Such ideas are present

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.148. BDB agree that 793 is denominative. Cf. also Ex.30:12-16.



in the non-cultic usage of the verb in the passages mentioned above, and also in Prov. 16:14 and possibly Jer.18:23. The former verse reads, "The wrath of a king is as a messenger of death, but a wise man will appease it (Heb.

וַיִּפְדֵּי לִפְנֵי לַחַם עֵלִי לְאַשְׁרֵי) ". In the latter Jeremiah prays against his enemies, וַיִּפְדֵּי לִפְנֵי מַלְאָכָיו וּבְיָמֵי כֹחַ אַרְצָה... deal with them in the time of thine anger". Here "expiation" would be meaningless. The willingness to be propitiated lies in the free resolution of God, and the meaning inclines towards "forgive" - a point recognised by the LXX when they render וַיִּפְדֵּי לִפְנֵי by μετὰ ἰσχύος .

When we come to the cultic use of וַיִּפְדֵּי , we find Morris claiming that the relationship established between the noun וַיִּפְדֵּי and the verb וַיִּפְדֵּי provides the key to the understanding of the terms. He maintains that the general sweep of the sacrificial system suggests that an offering of a propitiatory character is being made: the

וַיִּפְדֵּי is offered primarily to turn away wrath.<sup>1</sup> It seems to us that here Morris over-reaches himself. Too much is built on the hypothesis of the denominative character of the verb and insufficient consideration is given to the conventionalising of the term within the cult. Even if (as we would maintain) ideas of propitiation were present in the original usage of the word in non-cultic connections, it

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.151.



does not follow that they were always present there, nor that they were necessarily present in the thought of later cultic usage.<sup>1</sup> It seems to us that in many of the cultic appearances of 𐤀𐤁𐤁 we cannot distinguish whether ideas of propitiation or expiation are foremost,<sup>2</sup> and we should therefore be content to render the word in terms of "atone-ment", "reconciliation", "forgiveness", i.e. words which include aspects of both.<sup>3</sup> This is notably the case with the frequent occurrence of the word in Leviticus and Ezekiel. It would appear that, while the ritual of sacrifice etc. was performed as a means of expiation, the whole action was regarded as propitiatory, in that the consequences due to sin in the divine anger were averted.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See G.B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, (Oxford, 1925) chapter 5, pp. 67-81.

<sup>2</sup> Commenting on passages like Num. 16:46, 25:9-11 J. Barr, (HDB, 2nd ed. p.282) draws attention to the apotropaic sense and "the awareness that the anger of God follows closely on the offence done and will not be turned away until proper expiation is made. In such cases it may be that no absolute distinction can be made between expiation and propitiation as the general purpose of the action as a whole".

<sup>3</sup> This is true of the use of 𐤀𐤁𐤁 in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There it generally means "to make atonement", e.g. 1QH. 4:37, 17:12 God atones for (not expiates) sin: 1QM 2:5 uses 𐤀𐤁𐤁 in a context where the idea of propitiation is present. Most significant is the development at Qumran of a doctrine of vicarious atonement. 1QS 5:8ff:9:3ff attribute atoning efficacy to the life and the sufferings of the community. 1QS 8:4-10 applies the language of atonement to the inner council of the community. At other places in 1QS and CD the individual makes atonement for sin by a renewed and complete obedience to the Law.

<sup>4</sup> See note 2 above.



The idea of propitiation is witnessed to in other words and actions in the OT. For instance, Saul's words to David (1 Sam.26:19) "If it is the Lord who has stirred you up against me, may he accept an offering", are clearly an expression of a propitiatory purpose. The incitement was caused by an angry God: it was not a question of sin. Again, in Job 42:8 the friends of Job are commanded by God to offer a burnt-offering, and "my servant Job shall pray for you, for I will accept his prayer not to deal with you according to your folly". That the prayer of Job is such as to turn away divine wrath from his detractors illustrates the thought of propitiation. Furthermore, in those parts of the cult which are not associated with קָדֹשׁ there is more than a hint of propitiation. Lev. 1-3 provides the data for the burnt-, gift- and thank-offerings. The use of the word קָדֹשׁ, so frequent in the sin- and guilt-offering ritual, does not appear here<sup>1</sup>: these offerings are said to be performed לַיהוָה לַרִיחַ נִיחַח לִיהוָה i.e. to provide a rest-giving or soothing smell, an odour that quiets Yahweh's anger, or placates him, Gen.8:21.<sup>2</sup> Most scholars would admit that the literal sense of this expression suggests "propitiation", but they think that such ideas passed out of currency at an

<sup>1</sup> The one exception is Lev.1:4. This may be an introductory formula to the whole sacrificial cult and probably means "atonement" in the general sense of renewing the relation with God, Cf. Vriezen, op.cit., pp.286-87.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ex.5:13 where הַנְחַחְתִּי אֶת־חַמְתִּי must mean "I soothe my fury".



early date, and that the phrase came to mean to the Hebrews what it meant to the Greek translators when they rendered it ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας i.e. "a smell of sweetness, of pleasure", presumably Yahweh's pleasure in the due discharge of his service.<sup>1</sup> This may be true and כִּרְחֵק נִיחָה may have lost its original force, but it seems to us that the entire motivation of these offerings was still, to some extent, propitiatory. They were not made to atone for sins: they were gifts offered to renew and maintain the relation between God and faithful men as one of favour and good-will. We would submit that a purpose of that kind belongs to the realm of ideas covered by the term "propitiation" (even though it be with a weakened force), rather than to the realm of "expiation".<sup>2</sup>

Sufficient evidence has now been brought forward to demonstrate that the idea of propitiation is not absent from the Old Testament. It belongs to the earliest non-

1 Cf. G.B. Gray, op.cit., pp.77-80. J. Barr, HDB, 2nd ed. p. 810.

2 I note that Vriesen says of the burnt- and gift-offerings, "These offerings were sacrificed particularly to propitiate Yahweh, just for instance as presents were used to please the king", op.cit., p.290. The shelem-offering he regards as a shared sacramental repast to strengthen the relation between Y. and the faithful. L.Koehler (OT Theology, London: 1957; p.187) also observes that the idea contained in the term "sweet savour" is that the offering appeases God's wrath. On the basis of the use of כִּרְחֵק נִיחָה at Lev.4: 31 Koehler includes the sin-offering (of which כֹּפֶר is used) among these soothing sacrifices. This is the only occasion on which the phrase is applied to this offering, and Vriesen (op.cit., p.288, n1) regards it (probably correctly) as a secondary text.



cultic use of 𐤒𐤒, but we would not go so far as Morris in claiming that it belongs to the entire cultic use of the word as well. It seems to us more likely that the term became formalised in meaning within the sacrificial system and signified then, as now, "atonement". When it was used in this sense we cannot easily decide whether the emphasis lay on expiation or propitiation: both ideas were probably present. Nevertheless, on the positive side, we have pointed to some passages where the thought of propitiation by the cult is clear, and we have suggested that the idea (with a weakened force) also belongs to those parts of the sacrificial system which were not directly concerned with sins.

Before leaving this discussion of the OT idea of sacrifice, it is necessary for us to assess the results of our discoveries for the interpretation of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι. We begin by recalling Dodd's claim that "the LXX translators did not regard 𐤒𐤒 (when used as a religious term) as conveying the sense of propitiating the deity."<sup>1</sup> It seems to us that the distinction to be drawn in the use of 𐤒𐤒 should not be between the religious and the non-religious, but between cultic and non-cultic use. In the latter ideas of propitiation are definitely present, and we may presume that the LXX translators consciously retained and expressed

---

1 Dodd, op.cit., p.359.



them when they used the word ἐξιλάσκεσθαι which had, as its regular meaning in Classical and Koine Greek, the sense "to placate" or "to propitiate". In cultic contexts the issue is less clear, but it would appear logical to assume that just as the Hebrew texts continued to use ַחַטָּאת in a formalised sense which included ideas of expiation and propitiation within the one act of atonement, so the LXX translators chose to retain the same word, ἱλάσκεσθαι etc., which probably gathered to itself (from association with the Hebrew term) a meaning which is peculiar to Biblical Greek. At an earlier stage in this study we suggested that, with reference to the meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι as it renders words other than ַחַטָּאת, Dodd's arguments against the idea of propitiation are not persuasive: now, with reference to the appearance of the word-group to translate ַחַטָּאת, we must present a similar judgment; his case against the presence of all thought of propitiation is not conclusive.

#### The New Testament Usage

The Verb ἱλάσκεσθαι and related words are not frequently found in the New Testament. The prayer of the publican at Luke 18:13 is ὁ θεὸς ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. Here the divine wrath is not expressed, but the holy reaction of God to sin is implied. The publican's approach to God is direct; there is no idea of the expiating of sins; his plea is that God may be gracious or favourable to him, and, although



mercy or forgiveness is the content of the desired attitude (cf. the later OT use of  $\text{רָחַם}$ ), a slight trace of the ideas connected with propitiation lingers in the background: God is to be favourably-disposed or propitious. In Heb.9:5  $\tauὸ ἱλαστήριον$  means "the mercy-seat". This is the familiar LXX rendering of  $\text{כַּפֹּרֶת}$ , the lid of the Ark or mercy seat, where the cultic act of  $\text{רָחַם}$  was carried out. Since this word belongs to the cultic terminology it is impossible to decide definitely whether the emphasis lies on the purpose of expiation or propitiation: both are included in the one sacrificial act of "atonement". The "mercy seat" is the place of atonement and reconciliation. In Luke 18:13 and Heb.8:12 -  $\text{ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν}$  (quoting Jer. 38:34, EV.31:34  $\text{כַּפֹּרֶת נִחַם}$ ) the favourable or propitious attitude of God is one of mercy and forgiveness.

The noun  $\text{ἱλασμός}$  occurs only in the First Epistle of John, at 2:2 and 4:10. The first passage assures us that "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous  $\text{καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν}$ ": while the second is concerned with the love of God: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us  $\text{καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν}$ ". Dodd rejects the traditional rendering "propitiation" in favour of "sin-offering", "a divinely supplied means of cancelling guilt and purifying



the sinner."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless there are signs that the meaning "propitiation" should be retained. In the case of 1 John 2:2, the immediate context (which Dodd admits elsewhere might make it possible that the sense "propitiation" is in place)<sup>2</sup> refers to an Advocate, and as Morris says:

... if we sinners need an advocate with God, then obviously we are in no good case; our misdeeds prevail against us, we are about to feel the hostility of God to all that is sinful. Under these circumstances we may well speak of Christ turning away the wrath of God, and thus ἱλασμός is a natural word in the context 3

In the LXX ἱλασμός is used frequently of the Day of Atonement in which ideas of expiation and propitiation overlap, and is found in Dan9:9 (Theod.) with the meaning "forgiveness". It is clearly used in a propitiatory sense at 2 Macc.3:33, where it is applied to the offering made by Onias to deliver Heliodorus from further chastisement. It would appear that the LXX does not use the word in the simple sense "expiation" (either means or activity): it means "atonement", "forgiveness" or "propitiation", and always within the context of the divine wrath. Only the first and third of these meanings are suitable in 1 John 2:2 and 4:10. If the proper rendering is "atonement" it

1 Op.cit., p.360.

2 The Johannine Epistles, MNTC, (London,1946) p.26.

3 Op.cit., pp.178-9. The NEB renders the word by "remedy for the defilement of sins". This is a theological interpretation and not a translation of the Greek word.



should be remembered that the idea of propitiation belongs to the total meaning of that term, in cultic usage. If, on the other hand, "propitiation" is accepted, we rightly emphasise the personal nature of the breach with God caused by sin, and we have "one of those resounding paradoxes which mean so much for the understanding of the Christian view of sacrifice",<sup>1</sup> namely that, from God's love comes the means of averting the consequences of sin. In this connection, the words of Emil Brunner are worth recording, "The revelation of the divine mystery of love in the midst of the reality of wrath is the "propitiation" (ἱλασμός)".<sup>2</sup>

The word ἱλάσκεσθαι occurs in Heb.2:17, but the context provides no reference to the wrath of God. The verb is followed by the accusative of sin - εἰς τὸ ἱλᾶσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ - and it is urged that this indicates that "to expiate" is the meaning of the term here. Morris again prefers the traditional rendering and translates "to make propitiation with regard to the sins of the people",<sup>3</sup> pointing out that there are occasions when other verbs appear with an accusative construction, though they are usually followed by a preposition (e.g. εὐδοκέω, ἀπορέω ).

1 Morris, op.cit., p.179.

2 The Mediator (ET. London, 1944) p.320. Cf. LXX Ps. 77:38.

3 Op.cit., p.176.



In support of his thesis he marshals the following arguments: (i) the fact that Christ is said to be "a merciful High Priest" implies the possibility of God punishing in wrath; (ii) the phrase  $\tauὰ \piρὸς τὸν θεόν$  directs the mind to the Godward rather than the manward aspect of atonement and the former, when expressed by  $ἱλάσκεσθαι$  is likely to include ideas of propitiation; (iii) the accusative of sin after the verb, when it occurs, seems to imply the thought of propitiation; (iv) the variant reading  $τὰς ἁμαρτίας$  (attested by A, 5, 33, 623, 913, Athan. Chrys. Bentley) arose because the accusative was felt to be a difficult construction after  $ἱλάσκεσθαι$ , and this would indicate that "expiate" was not the accepted meaning of the verb in those circles in which the variant arose. Although Sirach 5:6 and 34:19 (which Morris does not mention) might support the third argument, one is left with the impression that Morris is here making a virtue out of necessity. The passage moves in the realm of cultic ideas and terminology, and, on that account, it is doubtful whether it is correct to interpret the verb exclusively in terms of propitiation. Is it not more likely that the general cultic usage of the verb to suggest "atonement" is uppermost here, a usage which includes ideas of forgiveness,<sup>1</sup> as well as of expiation and propitiation?

<sup>1</sup> This seems to be the simplest rendering of  $ἐξιλάσκεσθαι$  with the acc. of sin in Dan. 9:24 and Sirach.



We come now to the much-debated word ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25. Since this term appears in a critical section in the most important of the Epistles, it demands careful and comprehensive examination. Dodd's comment says:

Here it is unnecessary for our present purpose to decide whether ἱλαστήριον is an adjective in the accusative singular masculine or a neuter substantive. In any case, the meaning conveyed (in accordance with LXX usage, which is constantly determinative for Paul) is that of expiation, not that of propitiation. 1

Now we agree that the meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι etc. in Biblical Greek will be the best guide to Paul's use of the related word here, but on the basis of the preceding discussion we cannot agree with the affirmation that the LXX uses the words solely with the meaning "expiation". The matter is not so simple. The idea of propitiation is unmistakably present when ἐξιλάσκεσθαι translates אָפַחַד (Zech. 7:2, 8:22; Mal. 1:9), often where it renders נָסַח in non-cultic contexts, and once each where it is found in the place of חָסַח (Ps. 106:30) and of נָסַח (1 Sam. 6:3). The idea of propitiation cannot be dismissed simply on the basis of LXX usage. But are there any other guides to the meaning? The immediate context of the word does not offer any help and we must consider the Pauline theme which has been expressed in the Epistle up to this verse. Now it cannot be denied that the opening chapters of Romans have a single, I op. cit., p. 360.



dominating purpose, namely, to demonstrate that all men lie under the condemnation and wrath of God. The ὀργή Θεοῦ is introduced at 1:18 as being "continually revealed from heaven upon all impiety and unrighteousness of men", and it is never out of sight as Paul builds up his argument that Gentiles and chosen people alike are sinners and therefore under condemnation, and ends with that powerful catena of OT passages which leaves "no man living sinless before God". But now, Paul declares, a new factor has entered the situation. The effect of the law had been to show that men are blameworthy before God: now, quite apart from the law, there is a righteousness of God revealed, a righteousness leading to the justification of the sinner through the work of Christ, ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ. In such a context it would seem probable that the meaning of the term we are discussing includes at least an element of "propitiation". Other expressions in vs.21-6 may be held to deal with the aspect of judgment on sinners: there is nothing but this word to express the necessity of turning away the divine wrath.

The word itself directs the mind to the LXX use of ἱλαστήριον<sup>1</sup> to translate the Heb. כַּפֹּדֶם or "mercy seat", the gold slab on top of the Ark in the Holy of Holies, which

---

1 In 20 of the 27 times ἱλαστήριον is found it renders כַּפֹּדֶם.



was regarded as the special location of God's presence and which was sprinkled with blood on the Day of Atonement. Dr. T.W. Manson accepts this connection, and regards it as being reinforced by the fact that ἱλαστήριον<sup>1</sup> is often used of places. He concludes that the word in Rom3:25 means either "an expiatory place or object" or more probably in Jewish-Christian usage "the place where God shows mercy to man".<sup>2</sup> The whole background of Paul's expression lies (Manson thinks) in the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement when the mercy of God was supremely manifested at the mercy-seat. This is an attractive interpretation, but it has not won universal assent. Leon Morris has submitted it to careful investigation and claims that, while it is difficult to give final proof either way, "it is to be contended that the balance of probability is strongly in the direction of seeing in ἱλαστήριον in Rom.3 a general reference to the removal of the wrath of God, rather than a specific reference either to the mercy-seat or to the Day of Atonement ceremonies."<sup>3</sup> He prefers to translate it as "means of propitiation". His arguments are cogent and may be summarised: (1) ἱλαστήριον meaning "mercy-seat" is used

1 As well as ΠΥΘΩ, ἱλαστήριον renders ΠΥΤΥ, i.e. a part of the great altar, 5 times in Ezek. It is used for the altar (Hesychius, Cyril), Noah's ark (Symmachus), even for a church and a monastery.

2 JTS, vol. XLVI (1945) p.4.

3 - "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Rom.3:25", NTS, vol.II (1955-56) pp.33-43. Quotation from p.43.



always with the definite article (cf. Heb. 9:5), save once, (Ex. 25:16), and there the addition of ἐπίθεμα has the effect of removing ἱλαστήριον from the realm of the general (any propitiating thing) to the particular (a specific object): (ii) the appearances of ἱλαστήριον which Manson regards as referring to places are not conclusively so; they refer rather to the propitiatory nature and purpose of the object (sanctuary, church or ark): (iii) the suggestion that Rom. 3:21ff should be interpreted in terms of the Day of Atonement ritual, with chaps. 1-3 representing an "elaborate confession of sin for all mankind" (Manson) is not convincing; the epistle of the Romans does not move in the sphere of Levitical symbolism, and a single unexplained reference to one part of the Tabernacle furnishings is unlikely; <sup>1</sup> moreover, the opening chapters of the letter are clearly a condemnation, not a confession of sin: (iv) it is doubtful whether the προ in προέθετο is strong enough to admit of Manson's emphasis "to set forth publicly"<sup>2</sup> and it is questionable whether the αὐτοῦ is to be stressed in the phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι in the interests of a contrast with the mercy seat, which was sprinkled with the blood of sacrifices: (v) it is harsh and complicated to make

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Deissmann, Bible Studies, (Edinburgh, 1901), p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> Moulton and Milligan (VGT, p. 536) prefer the meaning "offered" or "provided". Deissmann (op. cit.,) and Sanday and Headlam (Romans, ICC: 5th ed. Edinburgh, 1902, p. 87) accept the rendering "set forth publicly".



Christ at one and the same time, priest, victim and place of sprinkling. In the light of Morris' examination some uncertainty must still attach to Manson's interpretation of ἱλαστήριον as the "mercy-seat" or "place where mercy is shown to man", and to his affirmation that the early chapters of Romans and especially 3:21ff are to be understood in the light of the Day of Atonement ceremonies.<sup>1</sup>

The form<sup>2</sup> and grammatical function<sup>3</sup> of the word ἱλαστήριον do not assist us much towards an interpretation. There remains, however, one other occurrence of the term (as an adjective) in a passage not denoting a cultic object. It is 4 Maccabees 17:22 where the death of the seven brothers is referred to thus: ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας· καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ὠσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου<sup>4</sup> αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσεν. Here the thought

I.W.D. Davies, PRJ, p.241 will not endorse Manson's detailed application of the ritual to Rom.1-3, but does accept the view that the background of 3:25 is the Day of Atonement.

2 J.Jeremias (ZNW, vol.XLII, 1949,p.197 n8) regards it as formed after the analogy of σωτήριον (Dapkopfer), χαριστήριον and καθάρσιον, and so as meaning "Sühnopfer".

3 The adjectival form does occur occasionally and the view that the word in 3:25 stands relatively with ον must be accepted as a possibility: the meaning will be that Christ is the "propitiatory" agent or object. The use as a noun is more common. But if Paul had wanted a masculine noun, then ἱλαστής was available: therefore it is more likely that the word is a neuter noun.

4 The reading of λ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου is possibly secondary. 4 Maccabees is usually regarded more as a



of the passage requires that the word be given a propitiatory significance. With regard to this very incident 2 Maccabees speaks in the following way:

We are suffering for our own sins, and though our living God is angry for a little in order to rebuke and chasten us, he will again be reconciled (κατα-αλλαγήσεται) to his own servants. . . I like my brothers give up body and soul for our fathers' laws, calling on God to show favour (ἵλεως γένεσθαι) to our nation soon. . . and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and in my brothers. (7:33,37,38)

The propitiatory character of the ἱλαστήριος θάνατος here in turning away wrath strongly suggests that same significance for ἱλαστήριον in Rom.3:25. This is as far as most writers draw out the parallel, but the similarities between the two passages, (most of which are noticed by Morris in the discussion cited) are such as to invite comment. (i) Both contexts declare that the wrath of God is active. (ii) Both refer to blood being shed and life surrendered. (iii) The death in both cases deals with sin. (iv) 4 Maccabees regards the deaths as a substitute-ransom (ἀντίψυχον) which gains deliverance, and Rom.3 declares that the death of Christ effects a liberating redemption. (v) Both passages interpret death as being vicarious. Here we may draw attention to 4 Mac.6:28-9: ἵλεως γενοῦ τῷ ἔθνει σου ἄρκεσθεῖς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκη· καθάρσιον αὐτῶν

Hellenistic-Greek document than a Hebrew work, but its community of thought in respect of this incident with the earlier books of Maccabees makes the expression worthy of consideration.



ποιήσον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα καὶ ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λαβὲ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν .  
 Of the event Buchsel says, "Only through substitutionary suffering, through personal self-offering, is the community atoned".<sup>1</sup> (vi) In both cases, it is God who provides the means of atonement or propitiation. This is clear when 4 Macc. says ἡ θεία πρόνοια (divine providence).. διέσωσεν .  
 Now in Rom.3 the word προέθετο (usually rendered "set forth") may be interpreted as "provided",<sup>2</sup> since the noun πρόθεσις and the verb appear several times in the NT in contexts where the idea of divine purpose or intention is clearly present.<sup>3</sup> The remarkable community of thought between 4 Macc.17:22 and Romans 3:21ff creates a strong presumption that ἱλαστήριον in the latter is used, as in the former, with a "propitiatory" significance. Morris thinks that it is not necessary to assume the dependence of the Romans verses on 4 Macc., but as long ago as 1925, Hastings Rashdall regarded it as "highly probable" that the 4 Macc. passage was the source of Paul's thought and expression.<sup>4</sup> We wish to conclude this study with a discussion of this possibility.

<sup>1</sup> Buchsel, TWNT, vol.3. p.323.

<sup>2</sup> So Moulton and Milligan, VGT, p.536.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rom.8:28.9:11; Eph.1:9,11. Patristic exegesis supports this interpretation. The double accusative construction is a difficulty, but the related word προορίζω has that construction at Rom.8:29 and Eph.1:5.

<sup>4</sup> The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, (London,1925) p.132.



We must deal first with the question of the dating of the two works. There is wide agreement that Paul composed the letter to the Romans during his three-month stay in Greece, probably at Corinth, mentioned at Acts 20:2f. The date of this visit cannot be fixed with certainty, but it took place in winter, some time between late 55 and early 59 A.D., and probably just after the completion of the Corinthian correspondence. A definite date for 4 Macc. cannot be provided. The fact that the Temple and its services appear in the book to be still in existence places it before 70 A.D. The most recent commentator on the work, M. Hadas, claims that the title given to Apollonius στρατήγος Συρίας τε καὶ Φοινίκης καὶ Κιλικίας reflects the state of affairs at the time of writing and not during the Maccabean period: if so, the date of composition must have been between 20 and 54 A.D., for it was only in those years that Cilicia was associated with Syria for administrative purposes.<sup>1</sup> Hadas himself suggests that, since there are references to a state of peace being enjoyed by the nation, the work belongs to the middle or end of Caligula's reign (37-41 A.D.) before the persecution linked with his name.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, ed. M. Hadas, (Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series; New York, 1953.)

<sup>2</sup> Many commentators place the work about this time. Joachim Jeremias, Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt (Göttingen, 1958) dates it to c. 38 A.D. A Dupont-Sommer, Le Quatrième Livre des Macchabées, (Paris, 1939) puts it nearly a century later.



There is therefore no impediment on the basis of date to the suggestion of dependence. The probability that 4 Macc. was written in Alexandria and is strongly tinged with Greek philosophical ideas does not necessarily militate against direct literary influence.

Whether or not we posit literary dependence, we must investigate the nature and likelihood of the shared ideas. It is quite clear that 4 Macc. is one of the finest expressions of the glory of martyrdom. Around this theme there had grown up in Judaism a theology within which the sufferings of righteous men and the deaths of martyrs were regarded (i) as being examples of supreme obedience to the demands of God, (ii) as having atoning significance and (iii) as creating merit which availed for others. Such views about the value of suffering were very old in Judaism, and found clear expression in the Rabbinic writings which contain many reports of martyrdoms to which vicarious atoning power is ascribed.<sup>1</sup> The same ideas are hinted at in such works as the Assumption of Moses, the Psalms of Solomon, parts of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and are clearly put forward in the works commemorative of the Maccabees. If we are to claim that the language and thought of this Jewish belief were present in Rom.3 we must seek

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gen. R.44 on v.15; Exod. R.38.4. Moses, David, Ezekiel, Job, Jonah and Isaac were thought of as suffering vicariously for the sins of the people.



to discover whether or not they are witnessed to elsewhere in Paul. In this connection, it is noteworthy that recent scholarship has been asserting the influence of the righteous-martyr theology on NT Christology and soteriology. C.K. Barrett allows it prominence in his discussion of Mark 10:45;<sup>1</sup> it is present to the thought of E. Schweizer when he interprets Jesus' life and death in terms of the "Suffering Righteous" of Wisdom 3-4;<sup>2</sup> H.J. Schoeps asserts that it foreshadows Pauline soteriology,<sup>3</sup> and W.D. Davies regards it as a pattern of thought familiar to the Apostle and used by him. Davies indicates that the idea of the righteous obedience of the martyr appears at Rom.5:13-18 and Phil.2:8, that the notion of the atoning significance of suffering underlies Rom.8:6-8,17-19, that the theme of the merits of the righteous is basic to Rom.5 and suggested in 9:5 and 11:28.<sup>4</sup> Since this theology of the martyrs - a well defined element in the religious milieu out of which

1 New Testament Studies for T.W. Manson, (Manchester, 1959) p.1-18.

2 Particularly in his book Lordship and Discipleship (SCM: London, 1960). Also NTS, vol.II, (1955-56) p.88.

3 Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the light of Jewish religious History (ET: London, 1961) p.128. He thinks that the "Binding of Isaac" is the ultimate pattern of thought behind Paul's theology of Atonement. This belongs to the same general theme, but references to it in Paul are hard to establish.

4 PRJ, pp.255-73. He notes that the terms "redemption", "justification" and "atonement" are the conceptions most often found in Rabbinic literature to describe the effects of the merits of the righteous.



Paul came - seems to have contributed to Paul's soteriology and to Romans in particular, it seems reasonable that we should interpret Rom.3:21ff in terms of the atoning value of the death of the righteous martyr and especially the Maccabean statement of that theme,<sup>1</sup> rather than in terms of the Levitical ritual and the Day of Atonement. As to the method by which the value or validity of the death is made available in his theology Paul leaves us in no doubt: it is διὰ πίστεως (ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). This is his unique Christian contribution to the theme.<sup>2</sup>

The possibility of a community of ideas between Romans and 4 Maccabees leads to a further point. Indications derived from the latter suggest that the book was not a mere literary exercise, but an address given to an audience<sup>3</sup> on a set occasion (κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν 1:10). If our text does not record the actual address, it is probably a later revision and extension of it. But for what occasion was the address composed? Do we know of any festival at which the seven martyrs were remembered? In an article in

1 This point of view has been advanced recently by E.Lohse, Martyrer und Gottesknecht, (FRLANT 46, Göttingen, 1955).

2 It is interesting that R.Bultmann (Theology of the NT, Eng. trans. London, 1952, vol.1 pp.46-7) and E.Kasemann (ZNW, XLIII 1950-1, pp.150-54) and others who regard Rom.3:25 as a pre-Pauline tradition concerning the death of Jesus, claim that he added to it the all-important words διὰ πίστεως.

3 Cf. the use of the 2nd person throughout, and especially 1:10 and 12.



The Hibbert Journal for 1917, B.W. Bacon examined with great acuteness the leading features of the Feast of the Dedication with special reference to 4 Maccabees.<sup>1</sup> It is well-known that this festival, beginning on Chisleu 25 and known as the Feast of Hannukkah or 'Εγκαινία, ("illumination" or more probably "renewal") commemorated the rededication of the Temple in 165 B.C., but Bacon claims that the remembrance of the seven martyrs who prepared the way for its recovery from Antiochus was a significant feature of the festival for a long time after its inauguration.<sup>2</sup> This part of the festival's content and purpose was largely forgotten by Pharisaic Judaism, probably because of the unworthy record of the successors of the Maccabaeans in the Sadducean priest-nobility; but Hellenistic Judaism made up

1 "The Festival of Lives given for the Nation in Jewish and Christian Faith", Vol. XV, pp.256-278.

2 For one thing, the kindling of the seven lamps suggests a recollection of the seven martyrs. Then, 2 Mac. (which also remembers the martyrdom) gives directions for the due observance of the Feast of Dedication (ch. 1-2). The possibility that Hannukkah derived from a pre-existing (pagan) feast an interest in renewal and revival makes it a fitting festival for the remembrance of the men whose faithfulness won them resurrection. The later piyyut מִן הַשֵּׁנִי לַחֲמִישִׁי לַחֲמִישִׁי לַחֲמִישִׁי commemorating the seven brothers and their mother is designed for the Sabbath of Hannukkah (L.Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge Berlin 1832, p.124). J. Freudenthal, Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift (Breslau, 1869) suggested that 4 Mac. presents a sermon (or expansion of a sermon) given during the Hannukkah festival. Cf. H.Gressmann, Tower of Babel, p.73 n.30. The Ninth of Ab was another occasion on which the Maccabees were remembered, see J. Obermann, "The Sepulchre of the Maccabean Martyrs", JBL, vol. L, 1931, pp.250-265.



for the ingratitude of the Palestinian synagogue and preserved the Books of Maccabees, glorying in the memory of the great deliverers. At a later date there was even a cult of the martyrs' graves at Antioch in which Christians for a time shared.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore probable that 4 Macc. (or part of it) is, in Bacon's phrase, "a Memorial Day Address" composed for and repeated on the occasion of the Feast of Dedication.

Now if the 4 Macc. statement concerning the martyrdom of the seven brothers influenced Paul's thought and language in Rom.8 and if, as seems likely, the remembrance of their deaths was associated with the Feast of Dedication, then we may be able to find more convincing traces of the influence of the Jewish Festal calendar on Paul's correspondence with Corinth and Rome than those suggested by T. W. Manson.<sup>2</sup> It may be recalled that Manson claimed that 1 Corinthians was written around the Passover season and that that ritual was present in Paul's thought (cf. ch.5:7ff); that 2 Corinthians 1-9 (written in the autumn) contains themes associated with Tabernacles (ch.5)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Bammel, "Zum jüdischen Märtyrerkult", TLZ, Vol. LXXVIII, 1953, pp.119ff. and H.A. Fischel, "Prophet and Martyr", JQR, n.s. XXXVII (1947) pp.265ff and 363ff.

<sup>2</sup> JTS, Vol. XLVI (1948) pplff. Manson does not give the precise year in which he thinks the correspondence took place. Uncertainty prevails on this matter, but, in any case, neither Manson's argument nor that which I will present require any special year: any one of those suggested (54-59) can sustain the position. What is necessary is that Romans should have been written soon after the



and the New Year (the giving of the Law compared with the promulgation of the Gospel). He goes on to suggest that the thought of Romans, particularly in chapter 3, was partially inspired by the ritual of the Day of Atonement of the same year. But would that not place the writing of Romans too close to the completion of the Corinthian correspondence, since the Day of Atonement falls less than two weeks after the festival of the New Year? It seems to us that it is more probable that if the occurrence of a festival turned Paul's mind to a certain theme in his writing of Romans, that festival was the Feast of Dedication. It began on Chisleu 25 (i.e. two and a half months after the New Year) and thus took place in the winter, and Paul is generally regarded as having written Romans in the winter season (Acts 20;2ff). The epistle, as we have seen, bears traces of the influence of the martyr-theology: now one of the supreme expressions of that theology (4 Macc.) was associated with the death of the seven Maccabaeen heroes and they were commemorated at the Feast of Dedication. Was the language and thought of propitiatory, atoning death given to Paul, as he wrote Romans, by the remembrance of the Maccabaeen martyrdom at the Feast of Hannukkah? We cannot of course prove this hypothesis, but it is a fascinating idea that the sequence of Jewish festivals Corinthian correspondence and in the winter season. Both these points are widely accepted.



may have influenced, at certain points, Paul's presentation of the Gospel.

In the course of this study of ἱλάσκεισθαι etc. and their Biblical background a number of significant principles for the interpretation of the meaning of words has become clear. In the first place, the careful investigation of context has appeared of primary importance. That Dodd has neglected this is the chief fault of his work: he misses the frequent references to the divine wrath which suggest the idea of propitiation in words of the ἱλάσκεισθαι class. Secondly, his dependence solely on the meaning of the Hebrew word for the interpretation of the Greek word which renders or corresponds to it allows him to overlook the fact that the choice of the particular Greek word may have its own significance in the translator's work. In assessing the meaning of Greek terms, the Greek of the LXX merits some consideration in its own right. It is necessary to ask why and with what meaning the LXX uses a particular word, especially when it appears to be a strange rendering of the Hebrew. With reference to the words studied, their translation may have been designed to keep alive the idea of propitiation. At one point (in discussing Ps. 106;30) Dodd has neglected a crucial example of the use of ἐξιλασκεισθαι which would be prejudicial to his own thesis. Again, his distinction between the religious and non-



religious use of  $\text{כִּפּוּר}$  is inadequate. Here we have considered it right to investigate the history of meaning and have suggested that the root probably developed from an original non-cultic usage to the conventionalised meaning within the cultus. In this we have profited by Morris' study and we have found evidence for the idea of propitiation in early, non-cultic usage. Morris, however, seems to have allowed his exegesis of some cultic passages to be governed by the thesis he wishes to sustain and his interpretations (in terms solely of propitiation) are, in places, rather forced. To us it has seemed the better course to allow for the presence of ideas of both expiation and propitiation within the cultic system of atonement.

The claims which our background study permits us to make regarding the meaning of  $\text{ἱλασέσθαι}$  have been fully taken into account in our treatment of the important Romans passage. We have also gone further and sought to discover not only the theme which is being expressed, but also the general background of thought in Paul's mind. This, we submit, is not the cultic ritual of the Day of Atonement (which causes us to reject the view that  $\text{ἱλαστήριον}$  means "mercy-seat") but lies rather in the 4 Maccabees passage which contains the only non-cultic occurrence of the word, and that in a passage with striking resemblances to Paul's language and thought. This hypothesis has enabled us to



interpret ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3 in terms of the atoning and propitiatory suffering of the righteous martyr. Since the character of contemporary events is significant in gauging the orientation of a writer's thought, it is perhaps of more than a little interest that the probable chronology of the Pauline writings makes it possible to suggest that the thought of the Epistle to the Romans was influenced by the themes of the Feast at which the seven Maccabean martyrs (in whose honour 4 Maccabees was composed) were commemorated.



THE BACKGROUND AND USAGE OF λύτρον  
and cognate words in Biblical Greek.

	Page
I. Classical Greek Usage	77
II. The Old Testament Background	84
III. The Words in the Septuagint	92
IV. The Usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls	101
V. The Use of the λύτρον - words in Philo	105
VI. Redemption in Judaism: Rabbinic and other sources	110
VII. The New Testament Usage	116
VII. Concluding Summary	140



The group of words associated with the term λύτρον (ransom) in the Greek of the New Testament is the usual, but not the exclusive,<sup>1</sup> means of expressing the idea of redemption. The following survey of the linguistic usage of the λύτρον - words is an attempt to penetrate the meaning which the terms had for the writers of the New Testament documents and, as such, is a necessary preliminary to any statement or interpretation of the Christian doctrine of Redemption.

### I. Classical Greek Usage

The word λύτρον and its derivatives go back to the verb λύειν which has the general meaning "to loose". Among the varied extensions of its use, this verb, when applied to persons, commonly means "to release, to set free from bonds, danger or difficulty". It developed a particular usage with reference to the freeing of prisoners when a ransom was supplied as the condition of release, and so came to signify "to release on receipt of a ransom, to hold to ransom (act.)" and "to secure release by payment of a ransom (mid.)"<sup>2</sup> Now the suffix -τρον (contracted from -τήριον) denotes, basically, the instrument or means by which the action of the verb is accomplished, so that λύτρον will signify "the means of releasing": or if Debrunner is correct in suggesting a stage at which the suffix denoted ἡγοράζω, ἐξαγοράζω and περιποιεῖμαι express the same idea.

2 Cf. LS, λύω 2c, for examples of this from Homer onwards.



payment,<sup>1</sup> it will mean "the price of releasing". This is the basic significance of the word according to Liddell and Scott who go on to list the various senses in which it is used: (a) ransom (almost always in the plural; in the sing. at Diod.Sic.20,84 and Plut.Moral.2,295c) or ransom money e.g. Iliad 24 (title and Herod.5,77 τῶν λ. τῇν δεκάτην , and used with such verbs as λαβεῖν , ἀποδιδόναι and καταθεῖναι in Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes. It would appear to be as a special application of this sense that the word (in the plural) is used in inscriptions and papyri to mean "the sum paid" for the manumission of slaves (p.Oxy.48b,49 and 722:1st cent.A.D.) or for the redemption of a pledge (p.Bad. 3,4:2nd cent.B.C.).<sup>2</sup>

(b) the means of expiation or atonement (infrequently): cf. Aesch.Choeph.48 (reading Canter's emendation for λυγρόν ) τί γὰρ λύτρον πεσόντος αἵματος πεδοῖ; ("What expiation is there for blood once shed to earth"), also possibly Lucian Dial.Deorum 4,2.<sup>3</sup>

(c) the general sense of recompense (very rare): Pindar, Isth.8,1 λύτρον καμάτων and Ol.7,77 λύτρον συμφορᾶς .

<sup>1</sup> A.Debrunner, Griechische Wortbildungslehre, (Heidelberg, 1917) pp.176ff. So also P.Chantraine, La Formation des Noms en grec ancien, (Paris, 1933), p.332.

<sup>2</sup> See A.Deissmann Light from the Ancient East, (Trans.of 4th German ed., London, 1927) pp.327-328 for details.

<sup>3</sup> F.Steinleitner, Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike, (Leipzig, 1913) pp.36ff., interprets λύτρον in an expiatory sense in two late inscriptions from Lydia.



The process of word-formation which began with λύτρον continued and created a new verb λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι meaning "to release for, or by, a ransom". It seems that throughout the whole history of profane Greek literature this verb maintained unbrokenly the sense of "to ransom". In the active (according to Liddell and Scott) it conveys the meaning "to release on receipt of a ransom", or "to hold to ransom", of which "to redeem a pledge" (p.Oxy.530, 14:2nd Cent.A.D.) is a special application: in the middle the sense is "to release by payment of a ransom"; and in the passive, "to be ransomed". The suggestion that in this verb and especially in the middle voice the λύτρον-idea may be neglected and the meaning regarded merely as "to deliver"<sup>1</sup> cannot be validated from Classical Greek sources. The only three passages where the active or middle form appears (apart from inscriptions and papyri) are Plato Theat. 165e, Poly.18,6,1 and Plut.Cimon 9 and all these expressly intimate a price paid in the exchange.<sup>2</sup> The noun λύτρωσις is rare in non-Biblical Greek and the lexicons cite only three occurrences: Plut.Aratus 11 in which we read of Aratus giving 25 talents to his fellow-citizens who wanted money for (among other purposes) the ransoming of prisoners

<sup>1</sup> So Th.Zahn, Römerbrief, (1 ed.Leipzig,1910) pp.179-181.

<sup>2</sup> LS observe that in a 3rd cent.B.C. papyrus (Eleph.19,8) the passive of λύτρω is used in the sense of "to be released from obligation".



(εἰς τε τ' ἄλλα καὶ λύτρωσιν αἰχμαλώτων<sup>1</sup>): a 1st cent papyrus (Teb. 120,41) uses the word in the sense of "redemption of a pledge": and pap.Oxy.1130,20 (5th cent.A.D.) to mean "release or discharge from an obligation".

The compound verb ἀπολυτρόω occurs occasionally in the active voice, though ἀπολυτροῦσθαι (mid.) and the corresponding noun ἀπολύτρωσις are very rare. The way in which the active is used may be seen from the following examples: Epist.(Phil.) ap.Demos. 12,3, p.159 Ἀμφίλοχον... συλλαβὼν καὶ τὰς ἐσχάτας ἀνάγκας ἐπιθεὶς ἀπελύτρωσε τάλαντων ἐννέα ("to hold to ransom"); Pl.Laws 11,919a ὡς ἐχθροῦς.. ἀπολυτρώσῃ τῶν μακροτάτων λύτρων ("to release on receipt of ransom"); Polyb. 22,21,8 καὶ χρυσίου συχνοῦ διομολογηθέντος ὑπὲρ τῆς γυναικὸς ἤγεν αὐτὴν ἀπολυτρώσων (probably "to put to ransom", cf.Polyb.2,6,6 "to restore for a ransom"); Lucian says of Achilles, χρημάτων ὀλίγων τὸν Ἕκτορος νεκρὸν ἀπολύτρωσας ("to release on receiving a ransom"). Only two very late passages are cited by the lexicographers for the middle voice, Pantaenus, Strategemata 5,40 and Julian, Imp. Grat.VI (Teubner, vol.1, p.253), where the meaning seems to be "to release by payment of ransom" - λυτροῦσθαι<sup>2</sup> In Plut. Pompey 24,4 the passive is used - Ἠλω δὲ καὶ θυγατὴρ Ἀντωνίου καὶ πολλῶν χρημάτων ἀπελυτρώθη - and appears to mean "was

<sup>1</sup> λύτρωσις is related to the middle voice of the verb, i.e. release by paying ransom-money.

<sup>2</sup> For details see B.B. Warfield, "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption, PTR, XV, 1917, pp.211-212.



released for a great sum" (i.e. the passive of the middle sense). It is significant that in each of these cases the price of release is mentioned and the verb plainly bears the meaning "to ransom".

The noun ἀπολύτρωσις is also a rare word, but since it is an important one for our purposes (being the characteristic New Testament word for "redemption") it requires careful examination. In Pompey 24,2 Plutarch (in speaking of the pirates) says, σωμάτων ἡγεμονικῶν ἄρπαγαὶ καὶ πόλεων ἀρχμαλώτων ἀπολυτρώσεις ὄνειδος ἦσαν τῆς Ρωμαίων ἡγεμονίας where ἀπολυτρώσεις means "holding to ransom", i.e. the action of the active voice. In Jos.Antiq. 12,2,3 - πλειόνων δὲ ἢ τετρακοσίῳ τάλαντων τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως γενήσεσθαι φασμένων, τὰ ὅσα τε συνεχώρει (of Aristaeus paying the soldiers for their prisoners) - the meaning is "the price of release", without it being quite clear whether the emphasis lies on the receiving or the paying of the ransom. In the Epistle of Aristaeus the word occurs twice (12,33) with reference to the release of prisoners of war, and the ransom price is stated in section 22 as being 20 drachmae per person. We read in Diod. Fragm.37,5,3 (with reference to a slave who had agreed with his masters for the purchase of his freedom) that Scaevola φθασας τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν... ἀνεστάλῃσεν where again "release through ransom" is probably meant, with the emphasis on the action of the middle voice of the verb, that is, on paying. The word is found in another record of



manumission, namely a 2nd or 1st century B.C. inscription from Cos (Paton and Hicks, no.29) dealing with the liberation of a slave. Here it is suggested by Deissmann<sup>1</sup> and Zahn<sup>2</sup> that "deliverance" is the meaning, since the term ἀπελευθέρωσις describes the same transaction elsewhere in the inscription. B.B. Warfield<sup>3</sup> and Leon Morris<sup>4</sup>, on the other hand, claim that ἀπολύτρωσις is a more precise definition of the kind of liberation involved, i.e. a liberation by the paying of a ransom. Another occurrence of the word which may occasion some hesitation in interpretation is Philo Probus 114: this passage tells of a captive Laconian boy who "judged death a happier lot than his present valueless life, and despairing of ransoming (ἀπογνοῦς ἀπολύτρωσιν), gladly put an end to himself". One might argue that here the meaning is simply "deliverance": but the context, with its reference to slavery, suggests that the idea of paying a ransom price is not far from the surface of the statement.

As has been mentioned above, there is some uncertainty as to whether the noun ἀπολύτρωσις expresses the action of the active or of the middle voice of the verb from which it is formed, that is, whether the meaning is "holding to ransom" or "paying a ransom". Both Morris and

1 Op.cit. p.327 n.6 and p.321      2 Op.cit. p.180 n.51.

3 Op.cit. p.214.

4 The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, (London,1955) p.25.



Warfield, while admitting the difficulty in choosing, prefer to interpret it in the sense of the middle: but T.K. Abbott<sup>1</sup> examines the passages and claims that "as far as usage goes, it would seem that if we are to attach to ἀπολύτρωσις the idea of ransom, the word will mean "holding to ransom" or "release on receipt of a ransom", not the "payment of ransom" ". While this may be true of some of the passages (e.g. Plut.Pomp.24,2) it cannot stand for all, and the passage from Philo is clearly against it. In fact, the noun may take the sense of either voice.<sup>2</sup> With reference to Abbott's point concerning the rightness of attaching the idea of "ransom" to ἀπολύτρωσις, it would seem that the application of it is generally correct: in most places where the word occurs, the price of release is clearly stated, and where it is not expressed, the context suggests it, the only possible exception being the Cos inscription. So also with the other nouns; the context repeatedly makes explicit the notion of price, and thus gives precision to the meaning of the verb. In fact, our survey has shown that, throughout the use of the λύτρον - words and all their derivatives in Greek literature, there is a remarkable consistency in the retention and expression of the ransom idea.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ephesians and Colossians, ICC, (Edinburgh, 1897), p.12.

<sup>2</sup> So Zahn, op.cit. pp.179-181.

<sup>3</sup> The only exception which LS note among all the derived



## II. The Old Testament Background

Behind the use of the λύτρον -words in the LXX of the Old Testament there lie, in the main, two Hebrew roots, בִּלַּל and פָּדָה<sup>1</sup>; other significant roots similarly translated are קָנָה (though only in the noun form קָנָה) and קָדַשׁ. If we are to understand the use and meaning of the LXX terms for "redemption" we must examine the use of these Hebrew roots.

The actions described in the Pentateuch by the verb בִּלַּל are closely associated with the sphere of family relationships.<sup>2</sup> The word expresses the action of "standing up for" a relative (i) where blood has been shed, i.e. the avenger of blood ( בִּלַּל ) who makes good the family honour (Num.35; Deut.19:6,12; Jos.20:3,5,9; 2Sam.14:11), (ii) where the family name is in danger of dying out, i.e. the process of levirate marriage (Ruth 3:13), (iii) when land has fallen into the possession of strangers, i.e. בִּלַּל means "reclaim", (Lev.25:26,33), (iv) when a member of the family has become a slave, i.e. בִּלַּל means "buy back" (Lev.25:48ff).

Forms is ἐκλυτρώσθαι = deliver, Schol. on Homer Od.4,35. The text "we must look to Zeus henceforth to keep us safe from harm" is explained as meaning that they would have to hope "that after these things he (Zeus) may deliver ἐκλυτρώσῃται us from the impending distress". There is no suggestion of ransoming here.

1 Of its 99 occurrences in the OT the verb λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι represents בִּלַּל 45 times and פָּדָה 43 times. The nouns from these Hebrew roots are rendered 12 times by λύτρον .

2 Cf. the study of the terms בִּלַּל and פָּדָה in J.J. Stamm, Erlösen und Vergeben im AT, (Bern, 1940).



From its association with these actions it is generally assumed that the basic idea inherent in the root  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  is "to act as kinsman", i.e. to do one's duty within the family group by recovering what had been lost. Recently A.R. Johnson has suggested that all the actions required must stem from one common underlying principle and that the basic idea in question is that of "protection".<sup>1</sup> "It is the function of the  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  to "protect" the life or vitality of both the individual and the kin-group and thus preserve their standing in society by keeping intact their essential unity or integrity".<sup>2</sup> Whatever be the primary meaning of the root, its association with the action of reclaiming property led to its being used to express the process of redeeming (by adding one-fifth to the valuation) by the original owner of something he had sanctified to the Lord (Lev.27:13,15,19 etc.).

The verb  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  occurs 40 times with Yahweh as the subject. In this use, we may think of Yahweh as the great

1 "The Primary Meaning of  $\sqrt{\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}}$ ", VT, Suppl.1, 1953, pp.67-77. R.de Vaux, Ancient Israel: its life and institution (Eng, trans. London, 1961), p.21 agrees that the fundamental meaning of the root is "to protect".

2 Johnson, op.cit. p.71. He reduces the two stems  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  = redeem and  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  = defile to one, having the general meaning "to cover". The covering with a mantle (Ruth 3:9) symbolises the action of the kinsman: but "cover" may also develop towards the meaning "coat over, stain, defile". This, Johnson, calls "semantic polarisation" whereby, from one origin,  $\text{b}\text{x}\text{x}$  came to be used (i) of protecting from harm and degradation, and (ii) of suffering and causing degradation.



Kinsman or Protector of his people, who would succour them in times of distress and rescue them in times of disaster. Thus the word is frequently used of the deliverance from Egypt (e.g. Ex.6:6;15:13; Ps.77:15,78:35,106:10) and of the rescue from Babylon (e.g. Is.43:1,44:22,23;48:20;52:3,9;63:9 Hos.13:14 metaphorical,Mic.4:10). Moreover, Yahweh is spoken of 13 times in Isaiah 40-66 as  $\text{בִּיָּא}$  and the people referred to as "the redeemed ( $\text{בְּיָא}$ ) of the Lord" (Ps.107 2;Is.35:9;51:10 etc.) When used to describe Yahweh's action

$\text{בִּיָּא}$  is not confined to occasions of national liberation: it is used of individual deliverance from evil (Gen.48:16, Ps.69:18;119:154;103:4) and of the constant "redemption" of the saints (Prov.23:11).

It may be said that when  $\text{בִּיָּא}$  is used of Yahweh it means "to set free, to liberate, to emancipate" and the idea of "ransom" has fallen into the background, if not entirely disappeared. Yahweh did not pay to the Egyptian or Babylonian oppressors any price for the release of his people. Nevertheless many writers wish to retain this idea and point out that the deliverances effected by Yahweh are not effortless performances: the cost in terms of his strength and power is frequently stressed (e.g. Ex.6:6;Ps.77:15); For instance, B.F. Westcott says<sup>1</sup> ". . the idea of the exertion of a mighty force, the idea that the redemption costs much, is everywhere present. The force may be repre-

<sup>1</sup> Commentary on Hebrews (3rd ed.London,1903) p.296.



sented by divine might, or love, or self-sacrifice, which become finally identical". However it seems a very doubtful claim that the idea of the exertion and expenditure of divine power keeps alive in  $\text{בִּחְלָה}$  the notion of ransom price. An apologetic interest seems to dominate this interpretation and the significance of the difference in meaning is altogether missed in the attempt to make the usage conform to a presupposition. This we shall try to explain after we have looked at the root  $\text{נָחַל}$ .

If the verb  $\text{בִּחְלָה}$  has its roots in the realm of family or civil law,  $\text{נָחַל}$  appears to be related to the sphere of commercial transaction, in which there is no obligation arising from ties of kinship. The word means "to take a thing or a person out of the possession or ownership of another into one's own possession and ownership by giving a ransom as an equivalent or substitute for it". Examples of this may be found in the "redemption" of the first-born (Ex.13:12ff; Num.18:15-17), the "redemption" at five shekels each of the Israelites who were in excess of the numbers of Levites whom God accepted instead of the first-born (Num.3:40ff.) In accordance with this usage, the word is applied to the redemption of a slave-concubine: Ex.21:8 "If she does not please her master... then he shall let her be redeemed (  $\text{נָחַלָּהּ}$  ) "i.e. presumably by her father. The view that this means "he shall release her" appears to be



contradicted by the statement that, if this or other methods of giving freedom are not employed, "she shall go out for nothing, without money" (v.11). The idea of payment for her freedom (by another) is present in the text.<sup>1</sup>

Like  $\text{בִּלְאֵן}$ , the verb  $\text{פָּדָה}$  is used frequently (33 times) with Yahweh as subject. The deliverance from Egypt is so expressed at 2Sam.7:23; Deut.7:8,9.26,13:5,15:15,24:18; 1 Chron.17:21 and Ps.78:42. Yahweh's act in "redeeming" from the Exile is not often represented by this verb, though it does occur (Is.35:10,51:11); sometimes it refers to Israel's deliverance without mention of a specific occasion (Deut.21:8; Neh.1:10; Hos.7:13; Zech.10:8). Moreover the deliverance expressed by  $\text{פָּדָה}$  may be from iniquity or trouble (Ps.25:22,130:8) and frequently it refers, not to the nation but to the individual (e.g. 2Sam.4:9; 1Kings. 1:29 and often in Ps.) Of this use of  $\text{פָּדָה}$  (as with  $\text{בִּלְאֵן}$ ) we may fairly say that "deliverance" is the dominant theme and that the idea of ransom falls into the background. To stress the costliness of the deliverance in terms of Yahweh's strength and activity in order to keep alive the notion of ransom price (cf.Neh.1:10; 2Sam.7:23) seems to be an undue straining of evidence, dictated probably by apologetic interests. Wherever there is need to emphasise the exercise of Yahweh's power in saving his people, it is

<sup>1</sup> D.M. Stalker, New Peake: Exodus, para.194b and de Vaux, op. cit. p.86 interpret the verb in the sense of paying a price.



stated explicitly in the context. We have no right to read it into every occurrence of the verb in order to make the word retain a presumed original and single sense. The meanings of words are seldom static and unchanging and semantic development is often influenced by the events of history. It seems very probable that the words  $\text{בִּלְעָד}$  and  $\text{פָּדָה}$ , which had a close association with the idea of releasing slaves and of reclaiming persons and things,<sup>1</sup> were taken up into the vocabulary of Israel's writers as the most suitable terms to describe the liberation from slavery of those whom Egypt and Babylon had conquered, and the reclaiming by Yahweh into his rightful ownership of "the people of his possession".<sup>2</sup> This semantic development

<sup>1</sup> Whether this was the only or original use of the words may be open to question, for  $\text{בִּלְעָד}$  and  $\text{פָּדָה}$  are found in early material with the straightforward sense of "deliver", Hos.13:14, Mic.4:10, Gen.48:16 (J or E). The ransom-idea may then not be inherent in the words, but be dependent on their particular use in social and legal codes.

<sup>2</sup> In his book The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, (London, 1956) pp.268ff, Dr. David Daube points to this development as being that of the concept of redemption, although, for him, concept history is traced in word-study. Primitive social laws (like those in the Pentateuch) governing the recovery of persons and property determined (in his opinion) the way in which the Exodus was thought of and described. And the narratives of the Exodus influenced both the further history of the social laws by giving them their foundation (cf. Deut.15:12ff) and the direction which the ideas about God's intervention on behalf of his people and man in general were to take. Daube himself interprets the Hebrew words in terms of the basic idea of "recovery" and says (p.279) "Deliverance by God is 'recovery'. The notion goes back to ancient social legislation. It was transferred to the Exodus which, in turn, gave a new impetus to the social laws. It was applied to later deeds of God for his



does no more than extend and emphasise what was already the essential theme of  $\text{לְפָדוֹם}$  and  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  in their specialised use, namely the idea of being brought into freedom.

The noun  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  means "a ransom" and in its Biblical usage it refers to the price paid to redeem a forfeited life.<sup>1</sup> The first occurrence is typical: Ex.21:28f. a man whose ox has gored another man and whose life is therefore forfeit (in accordance with the ruling "The ox shall be stoned and the owner put to death") may redeem his life by paying a  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$ , a ransom laid upon him. At Ex. 30:2, the half-shekel is the "ransom-price" for the life which would be forfeited in the plague. Likewise at Job 33:24, the  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  delivers a man from going down into the Pit: and at Job 36:18 the severity of Job's sufferings forms a ransom which will be accepted by God in lieu of his life. In Prov.6:34-5  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  may mean either "compensation" for the outrage committed, or a "ransom" for the life of the adulterer. At Prov.13:8 a man's wealth is thought of as "the ransom of his life", i.e. as the means of securing people. It was also applied to the rescue by God of the faithful individual and to his final salvation of his own at the end of days. In the New Testament it is applied to the redemption through Jesus." See also the same author's Studies in Biblical Law, (Cambridge, 1947) pp.39ff.

1 The only occasions when this meaning is not compelled by the context are at 1 Samuel 12:3 and Amos 5:12, both of which occurrences probably refer to bribes.



him against oppression.<sup>1</sup> It seems to us that from this list we can trace a development from the use of  $\text{קָנָה}$  as almost a legal terminus technicus - the ransom exacted - towards a more general sense, retaining the suggestion of "exchange", but connoting mainly the means by which some particular freedom might be gained. Here Is.43:3 is important, because it is the only occasion where  $\text{קָנָה}$  is used in connection with Yahweh's deliverance of his people. "I have given Egypt for thy ransom (  $\text{קָנָה}$  ), Ethiopia and Seba in exchange for thee (  $\text{קָנָה}$  )". It is obvious that this is a rhetorical flourish, a metaphorical use of the term, but some idea of an exchange to obtain freedom is present. It may be that Cyrus is to be compensated for the emancipation of Israel by the conquest of these African nations which were not part of the Babylonian empire.<sup>2</sup>

Of some interest in connection with the use of the  $\lambdaύτρον$  -words is the Hebrew root  $\text{קָנָה}$ . The root means "tear away, break off", as in Gen.27:40  $\text{פָּרַקְתָּ עָלָיו מַעַל צֶנֶזְרָת}$ , "thou shalt break off his yoke from your neck". Semantic development appears to have led in two directions: (1) to

1 Prov.21:18 suggests an even wider connotation for the word. "The wicked is a ransom for the righteous" cannot be interpreted in terms of substitution, since that would involve the unwarranted assumption that the righteous would have suffered if the evil had not been accepted on their behalf. The vivid metaphor simply means that the wicked are punished while the righteous are delivered.

2 Cf. J. Skinner, Isaiah (Cambridge Bible, 1898) ad loc. and D.R. Jones, New Peake, Isaiah para.451b, p.520.



the meaning "break up, crush" and (ii) towards "break away, break free, rescue". At Ps. 7:2 we read "... lest like a lion they rend me, פִּרְקוּ אֶת־יָדַי מִצַּיִל i.e. crushing me with no-one to deliver". Ps.136:24 and Lam.5:8 both have the root with the meaning "to snatch from", i.e. to rescue or deliver. In the course of Daniel's words to Nebuchadnezzar (ch.4) we find at v.24 (EV, 27) חַטֹּאתַי בִּצְדָקָה פִּרְקוּ which means "Break off your sins by practising righteousness". It is improbable that the verb is used here in the derived sense (common in Aramaic) of "redeem": sins might be atoned for or expiated, but they could hardly be spoken of as "redeemed". The importance of these cases of פִּרְקוּ for our study lies in the LXX rendering of them, and that we shall discuss later.

### III. The Words in the Septuagint

In the LXX of the Old Testament books the noun λύτρον , usually in the plural, occurs 19 times. It renders ִרְדּוֹן<sub>1</sub> six times (Ex.21:30,30:12; Num.35:31,32; Prov.6:35,13:8) , the participial noun ִרְדּוֹן seven times (Num.3:45,48,49,51; 18:15; Ex.21:30; Lev. 19,20); ִרְדּוֹן five times (Lev. 25:24,26,51,52;27:31) and ִרְדּוֹן = "price" once (Is.45:13). In the 16 passages of this list which belong to legal sections of the Old Testament, and in the verse from Isaiah, λύτρον provides, in accordance with its use in Greek, the required

1 At Is.45:3 ִרְדּוֹן is rendered by ἀλλογμᾶ .



meaning, "ransom-price". On the other hand, the Hebrew word in the two Proverbs passages is capable of a looser interpretation, and it is just possible that there the connotation of the Greek term is correspondingly widened. The adjective λυτρωτός (Lev.25:31,32) and the compound noun ἐκλύτρωσις (Num.3:49), though not occurring in the New Testament, witness to the retention of the ransom-idea in the meaning of the word-group in the Pentateuch. The noun λύτρωσις occurs 8 times, representing the roots בַּחַל and פָּדָה, each four times.<sup>1</sup> In four of these occurrences, in the Pentateuch, it is employed in the straightforward literal sense of "a process of ransoming or redeeming by payment", as the contexts make clear (Lev.25:29 bis,48; Num.18:16). Outside the Pentateuch, however, the notion of price is not obvious. At Ps.49:7 מַשְׁכָּן יְיָ is translated τιμὴ τῆς λυτρώσεως: the presence of τιμὴ suggests that, for the translator, λύτρωσις by itself did not necessarily include the idea of payment. Again at Ps. 111:9 and 130:7, where the λύτρωσις is the gift of Yahweh, the implication of a ransom-price is hardly to be found. The same is true of Is.63:4, "The day of vengeance (ἀνταπόδοσις) was in my heart and the year of my redemption (λύτρωσις) is come": this year is the same as that of Yahweh's favour (61:2) in giving to Israel victory and

I At Judges 1:15 it appears as a mistranslation of מִן הַכֶּלֶב.



salvation. The noun denoting the agent, λυτρωτής, occurs twice, applied to God and translating בַּחֲלָ (Ps.19:14,78:35) with the meaning "deliverer" or possibly "protector", but without any suggestion of his paying a price for his people's release.

We turn now to the use in the LXX of the verb λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι. It occurs 99 times in the Old Testament books. Where there is a Hebrew base, it represents בַּחֲלָ forty-five times, פָּדָה forty-three times and קָדַשׁ four times.<sup>1</sup> We have already surveyed the use and meaning of these Hebrew verbs and have drawn attention to the significant distinction between the meaning of words derived from them when used in the legal codes of the Pentateuch, and when used of Yahweh delivering his people. The same distinction applied to λυτρόω, for, of the 45 times it renders בַּחֲלָ, eighteen (all with a human subject) connote the paying of a ransom price and these are all confined to two chapters of Leviticus (25 and 27): on the other hand, twenty-seven refer to God's deliverance of Israel and of individuals and these are found mainly in Deutero-Isaiah and Psalms. Likewise, of the 43 times the word λυτρόω translates פָּדָה, ten (all in the Pentateuch) refer to ransoming by the provision of a substitute, while thirty-three refer to God's deliverance of his people and

---

<sup>1</sup> Several other verbs are translated by it, but each only once.



these are found in Deuteronomy, Psalms and occasionally in the prophets. It seems fair to claim that, when associated with the idea of the divine deliverance, the word λυτρόω developed towards the general meaning "to release," to "deliver", with a weakening of the emphasis on the price involved.

In view of the fact that some scholars insist that the idea of paying a ransom in the costly exertion of divine power adheres to λυτρόω, when used of Yahweh's acts of deliverance, it seems to us worthwhile to look at (i) the other Greek word which translate ὁλῶ and ὁλῶ and (ii) the other Hebrew words rendered by λυτρόω. By doing so we may at one and the same time broaden the basis of our inquiry and more adequately gauge the meaning which the Hebrew and Greek words had for the translators.

(i) The verb σώζω renders ὁλῶ at Job 33:28, thus preserving the right meaning of the Hebrew verb here (cf. v.30), and σώζω represents ὁλῶ at Is.1:27 (σωθήσεται ἡ ἀρχμαλῶσιᾶ αὐτῆς). ῥύεσθαι appears for ὁλῶ at Gen.48:16 ("The angel who has redeemed me from evil") and eleven times in Isaiah 40-66. The same verb renders ὁλῶ at Job 5:20,6:23; Hos.13:14; Ps.69:18 (where ὁλῶ appears in the same verse translated by λυτρόω) and Is.50:2. At Job 19:25 ἐκλύειν renders ὁλῶ. These various Greek verbs quite clearly bear no suggestion of the ransom idea: they express simply



the concept of rescuing or releasing (by Yahweh). Since the LXX translators could thus often render the verbs  $\beta\alpha\lambda$  and  $\pi\tau\vartheta$  (with Yahweh as subject) by words so clearly denoting deliverance,<sup>1</sup> it is not improbable that, as we have already suggested, this aspect of the meaning of  $\lambdaυτρώ$  is dominant when it is used of Yahweh's action and to translate the same verbs.

(ii) Something similar may be said concerning the use of  $\lambdaυτρώ$  to represent Hebrew roots other than  $\pi\tau\vartheta$  and  $\beta\alpha\lambda$ . Admittedly these (with the exception of  $\rho\tau\vartheta$  which we shall examine later) are translated by  $\lambdaυτρώ$  only once each, but even such rarities may be instructive.  $\lambdaυτρώ$  translates the Piel of  $\beta\lambda\psi$  = "protect, to set in security" at Ps. 59:1: it renders the Piel part.  $\beta\tau\psi\eta$  = "rescue, deliver" in Dan. 6:28: and it represents  $\pi\chi\vartheta$  = "tear away, save or deliver" at Ps. 144:10. At Ex. 15:16 LXX (A) uses  $\epsilon\lambdaυτρώσω$  (all other texts have  $\epsilon\kappa\tauήσω$ ) for  $\pi\tau\tau\tau$ , where the idea of purchase may be present. At Ex. 13:13 a confusion has resulted in  $\eta\tau\upsilon$  being rendered by  $\lambdaυτρώ$ : even the error of translation in Ps. 32:7 reveals that  $\lambdaυτρώ$  has been drawn into the meaning "deliver" - "Songs of deliverance

<sup>1</sup> The unity of meaning in the translation variants is quite important. The variants do not prove that  $\lambdaυτρώ$  means "deliver", but they may offer further confirmation of what has already been proved likely. Dodd's use of variant translations of  $\tau\vartheta\omega$  (see above p. 36f.) appears to be offered as the thesis to which the meaning of  $\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is conformed; and there is no clear unity of meaning in the variants of the word.



The use of λυτρόω to translate רָצַח is of interest. We have pointed out that the root means "to tear away", with a development towards "to break off" and "to rescue". It was used in the Targums as the equivalent of בָּחַל and נָשַׁח "to redeem, deliver, save" (e.g. Is.45:17), and it has this meaning in Syriac, where purkana means "salvation". Now at Gen.27:40 it is translated simply by ἐκλύω, but at Ps.136:24 and Lam.5:8 it is translated by λυτρόω where the meaning of the Hebrew is clearly "to rescue or deliver". At Ps. 7:2 the meaning of רָצַח is probably "crushing (me)", but the LXX has μὴ ὄντος λυτρομένου μηδὲ σώζοντος <sup>1</sup>, where again λυτρόω is obviously drawn into the sphere of meaning of "rescue or deliver", and the idea of a ransom is not suggested by the Hebrew. A rather different situation obtains at Dan.4:24(27) where the verb is employed in the phrase "Break off (רָצַח) your sin by practising righteousness" and the LXX renders it by

<sup>1</sup> The LXX reading has led many scholars to suggest that the original Hebrew was בָּחַל לִי! רָצַח לִי! = no one to snatch (me away), no one to help.



λύτρωσαι . There is no justification in the context for this rendering, but it does reflect the use and understanding of the root  $\rho\tau\omega$  in Aramaic in the sense "to redeem", although it is hard to conceive what "to redeem sins" could mean. It seems quite unjustifiable to claim, as Warfield<sup>1</sup> and Morris<sup>2</sup> do, that the "acts of righteousness" are the purchase-price of the deliverance. A few verses later (Dan.4:34, LXX only) there occurs the only instance of the use of ἀπολύτρωσις : "at the end of the seven years the time of my ἀπολύτρωσις came, and my sins and ignorance were fulfilled in the sight of the God of heaven". Both Morris and Warfield claim that the word here must refer back to λύτρωσαι in v.24 which bears (according to them) a ransom-price content, and, although they admit that the emphasis lies on the deliverance achieved, they wish to retain for the noun some suggestion of price, in terms of the "acts of righteousness". In our view, this is a case of special pleading. The "breaking off" of the king's sins, which the LXX renders by λύτρωσαι (= redeem) caused a delay in the coming of the foreordained judgment (v.27-9): later, he experienced for seven years the retribution for his sins and pride, after which time came his deliverance from the full penalty of his error. We can see no justification in the context for closely

1 Op.cit. pp.218-219.

2 Op.cit. p.17.



connecting λύτρωσαι and ἀπολύτρωσις ; the former refers to the possibility of avoiding the punishment for sins, the latter to the deliverance which followed after the full penalty has been exacted: nor do we find present the idea of ransoming by the payment of a price.<sup>1</sup>

The verb ἀπολυτρόω occurs twice in the LXX, at Ex.21:8 and Zeph.3:1. The Exodus passage is a legal one in which the idea of purchasing freedom is present, in the

וְיָצַדָּהָא = "he shall let her be redeemed". This is translated ἀπολυτρώσει αὐτήν, which probably means "he shall release her on receipt of a ransom". At Zeph.3:1(3) the phrase ἐπιφάνης καὶ ἀπολελυτρωμένη (πόλις) renders the Hebrew רִצָּהּ הַבְּחֻלִּי הַרְחִיחַ. The meaning of the latter is "rebellious and defiled", the participle being from the second root (according to A.R. Johnson, the same basic root) בָּחַל = to stain, defile. The Greek translator has rendered the form in terms of λύω = to protect, reclaim, redeem. There is nothing in the context which necessarily suggests that the idea of payment adheres to the Greek verb.

Our survey of the λύτρον group of words in Classical Greek revealed that the words consistently retained, by reason of the precision of their contexts, the idea of ransoming by the payment of a price. It would appear that the same

<sup>1</sup> So also Büchsel in TWNT, Vol.4, p.354.



cannot be said with any certainty of their use in the LXX. Concerning the noun λύτρον itself we may still say that it bears, almost always, the sense of a price or compensation given for the reclamation of a person or thing, but may be metaphorically employed on one or two occasions. Five times out of eight the term λύτρωσις also bears the meaning "ransoming". It is significant, however, that sixteen of the nineteen times λύτρον is used, and four of the five times λύτρωσις means "ransoming", are to be found in the legal sections of the Pentateuch. The verb λυτρόω bears the sense "release by paying a ransom-price" only in the legal codes (accounting for about one-third of all the times it is used), but seems to mean "deliver, rescue" (without the presence of the ransom idea) elsewhere in the Old Testament. This opinion is in harmony with what was discovered about the semantic development of the verbs בַּחַל and פָּדָה, and is supported (on occasion) by the fact that λυτρόω can translate other Hebrew words which connote rescuing or delivering. The single instance of ἀπολύτρωσις should not be interpreted as having any "ransom" significance. The verb ἀπολυτρόω is used once (in a legal section) to mean "redeem with money", and once (Zeph.3:1) where this meaning would be inapplicable. It seems to us that from all this we must conclude that within Biblical Greek almost all the λύτρον words devel-



oped their wider sense of "deliver" (without implying a ransom-price) because of their use to translate the Hebrew words, especially the roots  $\text{בִּלַּל}$  and  $\text{פָּדָה}$ , associated with the activity of Yahweh in rescuing his people from bondage and reclaiming them for his own. Here the word-complex evolves in the direction of stressing the central theme of release, rather than the means of achieving it. In the vocabulary of social and legal transaction, however, the words retain the idea of payment and price.<sup>1</sup> This explicit association of the ransom idea with the  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ -words in a certain type of context, and the semantic development traced in the LXX translation will be of significance when we come to explain and interpret the use of the word-complex in the language of the New Testament.

#### IV. The Usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls

The development of meaning which we have suggested for the verbs  $\text{בִּלַּל}$  and  $\text{פָּדָה}$  receives confirmation, in the case of  $\text{פָּדָה}$ , from the usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The root  $\text{בִּלַּל}$  occurs only once in the discovered documents, and that in a passage reconstructed by Schechter: CD 14:6  $\text{פָּדָה} [\text{בִּלַּל}]$ . The context makes the suggested reading probable:

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps significant that the examples of late Greek usage cited by Deissmann (op.cit.) and Moulton and Milligan VGT, ad loc. as guides to the meaning of  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$  in the NT are almost all from legal transactions, which state or imply the theme of purchase. Commerce and the slave-market were the spheres in which this connotation was kept alive.



it concerns the use made of contributions of money by members of the community for the support of the poor and needy, "the man who has been stricken (with leprosy), he that has been taken prisoner by a foreign people, the virgin who has no kinsman, and the orphan of whom no-one takes care". This is an example of the use of the root in its basic sense "to protect, to act as kinsman".

The root פרה appears more frequently. The verb is used four times in the Hymns of Thanksgiving with the meaning "to release or deliver". (1) Col.2.32 ומצרת .. "from the assembly of the seekers of smooth things thou hast released the soul of the poor". (2) Col.2.35 ותפר נפשי מיד אדירים "thou hast delivered my soul out of the hand of the mighty". Here the author gives thanks that he has been saved from association with false worshippers (Pharisees or Sadducees) who sought to impose deceit and folly. (3) At Col. 17.20 the word "soul" is probably to be added after the verb [-] צרקתך ופרה [-], while (4) Col.3.19 records the author's thanks to God: "thou hast released my soul from the pit, פרתה נפשי משחת. If this passage refers to actual death,<sup>1</sup> then we have the root פרה used in connection with the ultimate deliverance and entry into immortal life. At 4Qpser on Ps.37 the verses 14 and 15 are made to refer to the wicked men of Ephraim and Manasseh

<sup>1</sup> R.B. Laurin, "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'", JSS, III, 1958, pp.344ff, suggests that it is a vivid expression for release from great trouble.



who seek to assail the priest and the men of his counsel, but (the commentary goes on) "God will deliver them out of their hand, ואל יפ(ר)ם מידם". Finally, the verb appears at CD 16.8. "As to that which he (Moses) said, 'That which has gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do' (Deut.23.23), every binding oath with which a man will have pledged himself, to carry out a principle of the Law, let him not redeem it (לאל יפרהו) even at the price of death": that means that a man must keep the vow which pledges him to obey a commandment even at the cost of his life. Here the idea is similar to the Old Testament "redemption of a pledge" and the suggestion of price (here an insufficient price) is contained in the phrase עד מחיר מות, "to the price of death". As in the OT legal passages the ransom content in פרה is provided by the clear expression of price in the context.

The noun פרת, "deliverance or redemption", is found several times in the War Scroll. Col.1.12 declares that the struggle between the Sons of Light and the powers of Darkness will be a time of great distress for the "people of the redemption of God, עם פרות אל". Because of the eschatological outlook of this document, it seems probable that this phrase means the "people who will be delivered by God", rather than a characterisation of the people from

1 S.Schechter, Documents of Jewish Sectaries (Cambridge, 1910) reads פרהו (פרהו) "make it void".



their past experience. This view is supported by the occurrence of the phrase פְּרוּת עוֹלָמִים "eternal deliverance" (in v.12 also) to refer to the hoped-for triumph of the community over the powers of evil. Col.14.5 uses the same phrase "the people of the redemption" in the prayer of Thanksgiving over the enemy dead: "Blessed be the God of Israel who keeps the promise of safety to the people of his redemption (לַעַם פְּרוּתוֹ)". The reference here may be either to the future certainty of ultimate triumph or to the actual battle just completed.<sup>1</sup> In any case, the meaning in these passages is clearly "salvation, redemption" without any suggestion of the payment of a ransom-price. Col.11.9 declares that God has taught his people how to make the Lords of Belial, the seven nations of nothingness, fall into the hands of "the poor of thy redemption (אֲבוֹן פְּרוּתְכָה)" and the word פְּרוּת probably bears a future reference. Again, Col.13.14 proclaims "Who is like thee in power, O God of Israel and with the poor is the hand of thy might. What angel or prince is like the help of thy redemption, וְיָמִיחַ [אֲבוֹן פְּרוּתְכָה]". Col.15.1 returns to the thought of 1.12: the struggle "will be a period of tribulation for Israel and of declaration of wars against all nations, and the portion of God (will be destined) for

<sup>1</sup> The latter seems more likely in view of v.10, "Thou hast kept thy soul (life) of thy redemption (שְׁמַרְתָּה נַפְשְׁךָ פְּרוּתְכָה)" i.e. thy redeemed ones, the community.



eternal redemption (אורל אל בפרות עולמים), and all the wicked nations for extermination". Col.17.6 refers to the party or portion of God's redemption (אורל [פ]רותו) to whom he sends eternal aid by the might of the angel he has glorified; and 18.11 speaks of the appearing of the "eternal redemption (in the future) פרות עולמים", which God is granting by the hand of his mercy to his people in their victory over the enemies. None of these occurrences possesses a ransom significance.<sup>1</sup>

A number of interesting points emerge from this survey: (i) the use of the root באל seems to have been avoided in the Dead Sea Scrolls, while (ii) פרה appears frequently to express general deliverance or release; (iii) the noun פרת is often used, especially in the War Scroll, of the hoped-for eschatological deliverance; (iv) it is clearly implied that the people of the covenant-community are those who have experienced "deliverance" from the unworthy worship of others and who will enjoy the final "deliverance" by God.

#### V. The Use of the λύτρον -words in Philo

Because of the contemporaneity of Philo's writings with some of the New Testament documents, it seems proper to investigate separately his use of the λύτρον-words, rather

<sup>1</sup> The root פרה occurs once in the Oration of Moses 4.2 in connection with the duties of the Year of Release or Redemption.



than include it in the survey of Classical Greek usage. At Sac.114 Philo quotes Ex.13.13 "Every firstling of an ass you shall redeem (λυτρώσῃ) with a lamb": the "ass" he interprets as "labour" and the "sheep" as "progress", and then continues, "If you cannot gain progress in exchange for labour, let the labour go as well, for the word "ransom" (λυτρώσῃ) suggests this, namely that you shall free (ἐλευθερώσαι) your soul from the care that has no end and accomplishes nothing". Philo goes on to ask (117) what is the meaning of the Levites being the ransom for the first-born, and he offers a variety of explanations. The first is that if nature forwards efforts for progress in base subjects, then the Biblical words suggest the doing of homage to God "with those firstlings and honours which are the ransom (λύτρα) of your souls, for they rescue it (ἀπαλλάσσω) from cruel taskmasters and redeem it into liberty (ἐξαίρεται εἰς ἐλευθερίαν)". The second interpretation is that Levi, Israel's first son, means the Sanctified Reason and was accepted by God rather than Reuben, Jacob's first son, who represents natural ability. This sanctification of Reason, Philo says (121) is the "primary meaning of the price which the soul that craves liberty pays for its deliverance and ransom (τὰ ψυχῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐφιεμένης σῶστρον τε καὶ λύτρα)". Yet another explanation of the redemption of the first-born is offered



in terms of the saving influence of good men in a community: "every wise man is a ransom (λύτρον) for a fool whose existence could not endure for an hour, did not the wise provide for his preservation by compassion and forethought". This process of saving by the merits of the good is perpetual: "the cities of the Levites were ransomed for ever (λυτρωτὰς διὰ παντός Lev.25:32) because the worshipper of God has reaped eternal freedom (αἰωνίαν ἐλευθερίαν)". It is quite clear from this whole section that Philo finds the λύτρον-words in his Biblical texts and quotes them in his work with the ransom significance which their contexts in legal codes required: but when he proceeds to explain the meaning of the passages the strict ransom sense is missing and the idea of freedom (ἐλευθερία) becomes dominant. Consequently the word λύτρον becomes a metaphorical or allegorical description of the means by which some particular freedom is achieved, rather than a literal term denoting "price paid". A clear example of this is Spec. Leg. 1.77 where Philo says that the first-fruit contributions to the Temple revenue are λύτρα, since "they are expected to gain release from slavery, healing of diseases, to secure freedom and preservation from dangers". Here the idea of equivalence is not present in the way it is in the passages which either quote OT legal usages (Spec. Leg. 2.116, 121, 122 etc.) or manifestly use the



words in the sense of the payment of money to purchase freedom (Spec. Leg. 1.135; 2.98; 3.145, 150; Heres 44). Philo's own interpretation of the terms is found again at Heres 124 where he illustrates the truth that God "takes" from us, by pointing to the ransoming of the Levites, and adds "this is the correct name, for nothing so well redeems to freedom (ἐξαίρεται εἰς ἐλευθερίαν) as to take refuge with God and become his suppliant". The half shekel of Ex. 30:12 he interprets as "given for the ransom of the soul when God frees with a mighty hand from the cruel and bitter tyranny of passion". As with Philo's thought, so with his use of language: it is impossible to find strict consistency. He quotes the Biblical texts, but he must interpret them, and this he does, in his allegorical fashion, without retaining in any recognisable form the common Greek idea of ransom-payment.

The noun ἀπολύτρωσις appears twice. In the course of the story about a Spartan boy who was brought into captivity (Probus, 114) Philo says, "He judged death a happier lot than his present valueless life and despairing of ransoming (ἀπογνοὺς ἀπολύτρωσιν) gladly put an end to himself". Simple deliverance may be meant here, but the context, referring to slavery and freedom, suggests that the idea of paying a ransom (the only method of gaining freedom from slavery) may also be present in the statement.



In extolling the glory of the number 10 (Congr.109) Philo states that "ten" in Abraham's plea for Sodom was τελευταία ἀπολύτρωσις. Now the Genesis story shows clearly that ten was the minimum number of righteous men for whose sake God would spare the city: that they were a ransom is nowhere implied. Consequently we may interpret Philo's phrase to mean "the final possibility (or condition) of deliverance". The verb ἀπολυτρόω appears once, in the course of an allegory on Jacob and Laban (Leg.All.3.21) οὕτως γὰρ ἀπολυτροῦται κακίων καὶ παθῶν διάνοια, "thus the understanding is delivered from vices and passions by stripping from the soul all voices belonging to the body and senses". Here the correct translation is "deliver", as in the Loeb edition: there is no need to try to extract the idea of ransoming from the text.

By way of summary, we may say that our study of the λύτρον -words in Philo reveals (i) a metaphorical usage which may properly be understood in the sense of "means of achieving freedom"; (ii) a use in Biblical quotations which usually connotes "ransom" or "the process of ransoming"; (iii) ἀπολύτρωσις is used once of "ransoming" (probably) and once of "means of deliverance"; (iv) the single occurrence of ἀπολυτρόω bears the meaning "to deliver, to free".



VI. Redemption in Judaism: Rabbinic and other sources

The use of  $\text{בִּחַל}$  and  $\text{פִּדְיוֹן}$  in the Rabbinic literature is worthy of some attention as showing the meanings attaching to the roots in post-Biblical Hebrew.  $\text{בִּחַל}$  is used quite frequently for the "redemption" of property (e.g. of fields and houses, Arak.9.1-4) and of things dedicated to the Lord (Arak.7.3-5). It is used also of "avenger of blood" (Mak.2.7 cf. Num.35:19ff). This is in harmony with what we noticed concerning the use of the words in the Pentateuch. As in the Old Testament, so in the Rabbinic literature, we find the root  $\text{בִּחַל}$  used often of the divine deliverance from Egypt, the Exodus.<sup>1</sup> Tractate Pesachim (Feast of the Passover) is naturally rich in such examples (cf. 10.5-6) but none of them requires the suggestion of a ransom-price in terms of the exertion of Yahweh's power. The word is also applied to the hoped-for future deliverance when Israel's afflictions will be ended. An example of this is the Seventh of the Eighteen Benedictions, a prayer whose historical origin may be in the Maccabean age:<sup>2</sup>

Look upon our afflictions and plead our cause and  
redeem us (  $\text{אֲנִי בִּחַלְתִּי}$ ) speedily for thy name's sake,  
for Thou art a mighty redeemer (  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ רַחֵם בִּחַל}$ ).  
Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel (  $\text{בִּחַלְתָּ}$ )<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Since there stand behind  $\text{בִּחַל}$  ideas of duty derived from family kinship, it is probable that this root, rather than  $\text{פִּדְיוֹן}$ , became popular to describe God's deliverance, because it suggests relationship, chosenness and the covenant.

<sup>2</sup> So J.H. Hertz, The Authorised Daily Prayer Book, (1959)p.140

<sup>3</sup> Of interest is the addition for Chanukkah and Purim to the 18th Benediction (which probably also goes back to the



Commenting on this passage, Leon Morris<sup>1</sup> suggests that the idea of cost in the expenditure of mighty power may be discerned, but adds "it must be admitted that this use of the term tended to be conventionalised, so that it is not always possible to insist upon this". The noun *bxia* is frequently used by the Rabbis to describe the coming Messiah, the great Redeemer of the glorious future. It seems to me possible that this application of the noun derived from the use of *bx* in connection with the Exodus deliverance, and that consequently the Messiah was naturally regarded as a Moses-like deliverer.<sup>2</sup>

The root *נצח* is regularly used for the "redemption" of persons and things, e.g. standing corn (Peah 4.7), dough (Hallah 3.3), dedicated produce (Terum. 6.5; Pes. 2.5), captive slaves (Ketub. 1.2, 4:3.1), persons from Gentile ownership (Git. 4.9). This is the usage we expect in legal and cultic transactions originating in the Pentateuch. It is significant, however, that the root

(Maccabaeen age) "We thank thee for the miracles, for the redemption (*נצח*) for the mighty deeds and saving acts and for the wars Thou didst wage for our forefathers in days of old, at this season". Here the Maccabaeen deliverance is regarded as a "redemption", the word used being derived from *נצח*, which we already noticed in Daniel, a book of probable Maccabaeen origin.

1 Op.cit. p.20.

2 For a survey of the Messiah-Second Moses motif see Moïse: L'homme de l'alliance par H. Cazelles et alii, (Paris, 1955) Sections I-III. Traces of the idea may be found at several places in NT Christology.



is never used in the Mishnah to describe the deliverance of Israel in the Exodus or in the future. In view of the fact that in the Old Testament (and particularly in Deutero-Isaiah) the use of  $\text{בִּלְבָּד}$  for God's deliverance of his people is far more common than the use of  $\text{הִצִּיל}$ , one may suggest that the notions of relationship and of recovery which are implicit in  $\text{בִּלְבָּד}$  are probably the leading themes in the Jewish understanding of "redemption".<sup>1</sup>

The noun  $\text{קֹפֶה}$  is used by the Rabbis as a technical term for a "fine" or "indemnity". It is the "ransom-price" which the owner of an ox which killed a man must pay to the deceased's relatives (i.e. the dead man's value) B.Kam. 4.5:5.3. Here the fine is treated as an atonement for one's own offence, but the term was capable of bearing a wider reference. The idea of the vicarious power of a kopher underlies the recurring expression "May I be an atonement for you", by which a man declares his readiness to suffer on behalf of others (cf. Negaim 2.1 ...  $\text{אֲנִי כֹפֶה לְךָ}$ ).

At this point in our study it seems pertinent to draw attention to the connection in Jewish thought<sup>2</sup> between suffering (particularly death) and atonement. Trad-

<sup>1</sup> We noted that  $\text{הִצִּיל}$  is the characteristic word at Qumran. Was this a protest against the common practice?

<sup>2</sup> It appears to have been within Palestinian Judaism that the idea of the atoning power of suffering developed. Philo and Josephus do not seem to know it: therefore it is unlikely that we should seek its origin in Hellenistic Judaism. For texts, see Rabbinic Anthology ed. Montefiore and Loewe, chapter 8.



itionally, atonement was regarded as coming through the cult and the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, but after the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of sacrifice it was considered as being accomplished by the life of obedience, through suffering and particularly through death.<sup>1</sup> While the idea that a man's death atones for his own sins is not traceable in pre-Christian Judaism, the theme of a representative atoning power is pre-Christian.<sup>2</sup> This vicarious atonement was won by the death of the righteous. Thus Test. Benjamin 3.8<sup>3</sup> reads: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven (Is.53) that a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men and a sinless shall die for ungodly men". The old Jewish tradition concerning the Binding (Akedah) of Isaac, which some scholars regard as having been influential on the Pauline doctrine of the Atonement,<sup>4</sup> reveals also the representative value of suffering. The whole theme may have owed

<sup>1</sup> See A. Büchler, Studies in Sin and Atonement (London, 1928) pp. 175-189; G.F. Moore, Judaism (Oxford, 1927) Vol. I pp. 546-552; S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (London, 1909) pp. 307-311.

<sup>2</sup> See R.H. Charles, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, (A. and C. Black, 1908) p. 202, and E. Lohse, Martyrer und Gottesknecht (FRLANT, 46: Göttingen, 1955) Teil I: Sühnetod im Spätjudentum.

<sup>3</sup> The form quoted is probably pre-Christian: the Christian additions are absent from the Armenian version.

<sup>4</sup> H.J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the light of Jewish Religious History (Lutterworth, 1961) ch. 4. Gerson Vermes makes a full study of the theme in Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden, 1961) pp. 193-227.



much to the content of Isaiah 53 and its interpretation. According to Pesik.27,174b it is to be learned from 2 Sam 21.14 where after the deaths of Saul and Jonathan God is said to have been entreated for the land (Heb. לָחַץ לֶחֶם <sup>ἐπακούω</sup> ). Examples of this doctrine are found in the traditions concerning the Maccabean martyrs, especially in the passages already quoted (p.63f. ), namely 2 Mac. 7.37 (dated either 38-34 B.C. or 41-44 A.D.); 4 Mac. 6.28 (from the third or fourth decade of 1st century A.D.)

Be merciful to thy people and let my punishment be sufficient for their sake. Make my blood an expiation for them and take my life as a substitute (ἀντίψυχον ) for theirs:

and 4 Mac.17.21-2 which thus sums up the achievement of the seven brothers:

They having become as a ransom(?) for the sins of the nation (ὥστερ ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἀμαρτίας ), through the blood of these righteous ones and their propitiatory death, the divine providence rescued Israel which had been ill-used.

No clearer or more profound statement of vicarious atonement can be found in Judaism and it may well be of some significance (as suggested elsewhere in this work) for the understanding of the New Testament statements concerning the death of Jesus.

To return to the use of λυτρόω in Judaism: Sirach uses the verb five times - 48.20 "The Holy One delivered (ἐλυτρώσατο) them (the people of Jerusalem) by



the hand of Isaiah". 49.10 "The twelve prophets... delivered (ἐλυτρώσατο)<sup>1</sup> Jacob by the confidence of hope". It is significant that the Hebrew verb in these two places is נָשַׁא "to save, to deliver".<sup>2</sup> In a confused addition to 50.24 (which is associated with the promise to Phinehas) we read "May he deliver us in his time, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ λυτρώσθω ἡμᾶς". The concluding prayer of ben Sirach includes among its thanksgivings to God (51.2) "Thou didst deliver my body from destruction (ἐλυτρώσω τὸ σῶμα μου ἐξ ἀπωλείας)" and without Hebrew parallel, "Thou didst deliver me according to the abundance of thy mercy and the greatness of thy name (ἐλυτρώσω με κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ἐλέους καὶ ὀνόματος σου)". The idea of ransom is not present in the Greek of ben Sirach: in his usage λυτρόω connotes release or deliverance.

At 1 Mac.4:11 Judas Maccabaeus, in rallying his followers, recalls the deliverance of the Red Sea and bids his men cry to heaven for the help of God, that "all the Gentiles may know that there is one who redeemeth (delivers) Israel and saveth her, (ὁ λυτροῦμενος καὶ σώων τὸν Ἰσραηλ)". The context, as well as the parallel provided to λυτροῦμενος by σώων, suggests that the ransom idea is not present here: the verb simply means "deliver, rescue".

<sup>1</sup> Ms. A and Lat.vers.read the plural, but the singular suggests the one volume which the works of the twelve latter prophets formed.

<sup>2</sup> R.Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, (Berlin, 1906).



It is claimed by Morris that the essential ransom significance is alive in the usage of Josephus, where the noun λύτρον appears for the "ransom" paid for prisoners in time of war (Ant.12:28,33,46; 14:107,371; 15:156; Bell. Jud.1:274,384).<sup>1</sup> That significance is certainly present, but it is the context rather than the word itself which makes this clear. In a context dealing with the freeing of prisoners by payment, the word λύτρον and any derived word could have no other meaning but "ransom".

Morris also assumes the ransom idea in Enoch 98. 10, "Wherefore do not hope to live, ye sinners, but ye shall depart and die, for ye know no ransom", cf. Ps. 49:7-9.<sup>2</sup> Since there is no clear expression of price in the passage, it may be sufficiently precise to interpret the word as "means of deliverance" from the doom of death.

In the use of the λύτρον -words, and of their Hebrew equivalents, in Jewish writings, the emphasis in meaning lies upon the theme of deliverance, except where the idea of payment is clearly implied or expressed in the context.

## VII. The New Testament Usage

Before we proceed to the discussion of the New Testament passages in which the λύτρον -words are found, we may recall two points from our earlier discussions. The conclusion

<sup>1</sup> Morris, op.cit., p.21

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.



we reached as to the special Jewish-Biblical character of New Testament Greek is of significance for the interpretation of this word-complex. If the papyrological finds of Egypt (which are predominantly fragments of legal and commercial transactions) were the clue to NT Greek, then Deissmann would have been correct in his contention that ἀπολύτρωσις , λύτρον etc. are to be interpreted in terms of the manumission of slaves, with emphasis on the idea of payment in order to gain freedom.<sup>1</sup> But if Biblical Greek provides a better source from which to investigate the words, then our survey of the LXX and Jewish usage reveals that the interpretation of their meaning is neither so straightforward nor so simple: themes and ideas other than those related to commerce and the slave-market provide the background of meaning, the most important of these being the theme of Israel's deliverance. The second point is related to the first. Since the New Testament writers were using this peculiar Biblical Greek, we must allow for the possibility (though we must not exaggerate it) that the 1st century readers of the documents interpreted the λύτρον -words along the lines of the familiar Greek of the market-place. Such a procedure would involve a significant narrowing of the reference of the terms and would influence the theological understanding of redemption.

<sup>1</sup> Deissmann, op.cit., pp. 319ff.



Bearing these two points in mind, let us turn to the consideration of the New Testament passages. The noun occurs three times in the New Testament: Luke 1:68, 2:38 and Heb.9:12. There can be no doubt that when Zechariah exclaimed "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for he has visited and redeemed (ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν) his people, and has raised up a horn of salvation (σωτηρίας) for us from the house of David", and when Anna spoke about Jesus "to all who were looking for the deliverance (λύτρωσιν) of Jerusalem", the word is being used in the sense of the long-awaited intervention by God to save and deliver his people into freedom and blessing.<sup>1</sup> The same is true of the remark in the Emmaus-road story (Lk.24:21), "We had hoped that he was the one to deliver Israel (αὐτός ἐστι ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι Ἰσραήλ)". In these cases there is no idea of ransoming or purchasing: the usage is in accord with that of נָצַח and בָּחַל in the OT and Jewish sources to describe God's deliverance of his people.

The third instance of λύτρωσις is Heb.9:12. Christ is portrayed as a High Priest who "not through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in, once for all, to the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος)". The sphere of thought is obviously the ritual of the Day of

<sup>1</sup> The NEB renders the word by "liberation".



Atonement in which, year by year, the High Priest made atonement for the sins of the people. It is important to note that in the OT the sacrifices of that ceremony were never regarded as redemptive in the sense of being a ransom for the life of the people. Even the scapegoat, on which the people's sins were placed (but which is not alluded to in Hebrews) was not strictly a ransom, but a substitute, a divinely selected means of getting rid of Israel's sin. The death of the animals whose blood was presented within the Holy of Holies made atonement ( 793 ) for the priest, his house and the assembly of Israel.<sup>1</sup> In view of this, one might wish to translate Heb.9:12 as Christ secured "eternal atonement". That, however, would be a sense strange to λύτρωσις , though we may recall that 793 meaning "ransom" and "means of deliverance" is sometimes rendered by λύτρον .<sup>2</sup> It is likely that we must choose between interpreting λύτρωσις as "deliverance" through Christ's death or as "redemption" at the price of his sacrifice. If we choose the latter (as Warfield and Morris do)<sup>3</sup> we must assume that the author of Hebrews, if he is being consistent, thought of the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement and of sacrifices for sin in general in terms of a ransom interpretation of OT sacrifice which not

1 Throughout Lev.16 the LXX consistently uses ἐξέλκεσθαι περί

2 Above p. 92.

3 In the works cited.



even Lev.17:11<sup>1</sup> would support, and which is not approved in modern discussion.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, if we leave aside the notion of ransom and interpret λύτρωσις as "deliverance", then we need say no more than that the death of the Victim (i.e. Christ) was the way or means of bringing deliverance from sin and into a renewed relationship with God.<sup>3</sup> This interpretation would preserve adequately the parallel between the significance of Christ's death and the death of the animals, both in the OT sacrifice in general and in the Day of Atonement ritual in particular.

Returning to the NT use of λύτρωω, we find that, in addition to Lk.24:21, the verb occurs at Titus 2:14 and I Pet.1:18. The passage in Titus says of Jesus, "He gave himself for us (ὕπὲρ ἡμῶν) in order that he might redeem us (ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς) from all iniquity and purify for himself a people for his possession (λαὸν περιούσιον)". The verse recalls Ps.130:8 "He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities" where λυτρώω connotes

1 "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement ( 799 ) for your souls: for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life (that is in it)", RSV translation.

2 If we cannot allow that this was the view of sacrifice held by the writer and if we still wish to interpret λύτρωσις as redemption at the price of Christ's blood, then we are forced to admit a measure of inaccuracy in the parallels drawn between Atonement ceremonies and the work of Christ.

3 The sacrifices of the Day of Atonement took place within the Covenant relationship.



"deliverance". If we stress the indebtedness to the language of LXX Ps.130 we may render the verb as "deliver", with the NEB. The fact that the release is made possible by the self-oblation of Christ would, on one theory of OT sacrifice, make the idea of ransom possible: but on the more generally approved understanding of the nature of sacrifice, the verse will be interpreted of "deliverance" by means of the death of Christ. In other words, the death of Christ is regarded as the divinely appointed means of reclaiming men from sin, but the rationale of its acceptability is not made clear. The remaining passage, 1 Pet.1:18-19, contains the idea of purchase. "You know that you were redeemed (ἐλυτρώθητε) from the futility of your traditional ways, not with perishable things like gold and silver, but with the precious blood of Christ". The realm of thought is that of the Passover and Exodus: but the notion of a price paid for the deliverance is clearly implied in the context and it would be difficult to miss a reference to the normal process of redemption.<sup>1</sup>

The RSV translates the verb "ransom" and the NEB speaks of

<sup>1</sup> F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, (Blackwell, 1947) p. 78, finds in the passage reference to the cost of redemption but draws attention to the fact that the author "does not use for this the genitive of price, which would be the normal way of indicating the amount of the ransom, but the dative, which is not used at all of price (at least not without a preposition) and seems therefore better taken as instrumental." E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, (London, 1946), p.144 claims that the use of the dative for redemption-price is an indication of LXX background.



"freedom bought". Here is a case in which, if the suggestion of the Exodus and Passover lamb were missed by the reader who knew little of Judaism, the current use of the word for the ransoming of slaves would convey the idea of deliverance from slavery into freedom by the payment of a redemption price.<sup>1</sup>

The noun λυτρωτής is found once, referring to Moses, in the speech of Stephen, Acts 7:35. The context is the New-Moses Christological statement in which Jesus is both likened to and contrasted with Moses, as the greater to the lesser. Moses was sent to his brethren, like Jesus: he was rejected by Israel's leaders, as was Jesus; but he was sent by God to be a "ruler and redeemer (ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν) as also was Jesus (cf. 5:31 and Lk. 24:21). The term clearly denotes Moses' function as the chosen deliverer of God's people from the bondage of Egypt: there is no suggestion of his paying a price in the action. The background of this usage is firmly in the LXX (cf. Ps. 19:14).

The special feature of the NT usage is the comparative frequency of the compound noun ἀπολύτρωσις. We have noted that it is a rare word in non-Biblical Greek and it appears only once (Dan. 4:34) in the LXX and that in a passage for which there is no corresponding Hebrew in the Massoretic text. While the non-Biblical texts give some

I cf. E.G. Selwyn, op.cit., pp.144-45.



support to the view that ἀπολύτρωσις implies the payment of a price for redemption, the single LXX instance of the word does not seem to require that sense: "deliverance" is a quite satisfactory translation at Dan.4:34. Now this rare word occurs seven times in the letters of Paul, twice in the Epistle to the Hebrews and once in Luke's gospel. It is obviously an important term in the NT salvation vocabulary and merits careful study. The structure of the word might be taken to suggest the thought of a "ransoming away" (ἀπο = away from) with emphasis on the effects rather than on the process of redemption.<sup>1</sup> This, however, would be to place an undue dependence upon word-form as the basis of interpretation: investigation of each occurrence in its context must be the guide to the measure of truth in the claim.

In praising the heroes of faith Heb.11:35 says: "Women received their dead by resurrection: some were tortured οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, that they might have a better resurrection", i.e. to the life of the Age to Come. The reference is most probably to the Maccabean martyrs under Antiochus Epiphanes and therefore the correct interpretation of ἀπολύτρωσις will be "deliverance" or "release". The lives of the martyrs would have been spared

<sup>1</sup> This is what Chrysostom meant in his comment on Rom.3:23: "and he said not simply λύτρωσις but ἀπολύτρωσις so that we come not again into the same bondage". The result of the deliverance, our being removed from bondage, is what interests Chrysostom.



if they had agreed to forswear their faith: the only means of deliverance was apostasy, and this they rejected. At Heb.9:15 the author speaks of a death (Christ's) as having taken place εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων i.e. for the redemption of transgressions committed under the first covenant. The expression "redemption of, or from, transgressions" is unusual; the meaning of ἀπολύτρωσις is very close to that of ἄφεσις in v.22: in fact, the idea of atonement would appear to be very suitable here, as in v.12.<sup>1</sup> When we retain the common translation "redemption" we are involved in the same dilemma as faced us in our discussion of v.12. Is the death of Christ regarded as the price paid for deliverance, or as the means (divinely appointed) by which atoning deliverance is brought about? Nothing in the passage points to or requires the first interpretation. It seems to us that the occurrences of λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις in connection with Christ's blood and death ought not to be interpreted in terms of the paying of a ransom price for redemption without careful consideration of their contexts which will, in fact, give clear indication (as at 1 Pet.1:18) where this idea is to be found, and without assessment of the theory of sacrifice

<sup>1</sup> It may not be without significance that in the Hebrew version of the NT (by Salkinson-Ginsburg) εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν is translated as לַחֲטָאִים, the only case in which any of the λύτρον-words, with the exception of Mck.10:45, is rendered by the root חָטָא, the usual Hebrew word for "to atone".



which such a view necessitates. Moreover, since the ninth chapter of Hebrews offers more than one interpretation of the purpose of Christ's sacrifice (cf. vs. 26 and 28) we are not obliged to construe evidence to suit a ransom theology as if that were the only understanding the writer had of the death of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

There are three occurrences of ἀπολύτρωσις in passages of an eschatological character:

- (i) Luke 21:28 Now when these things begin to take place, look up and raise your heads because your redemption ( ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν ) draws near.
- (ii) Rom. 8:23 . . . but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.
- (iii) Eph. 4:30 Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God in whom you were sealed unto the day of redemption ( εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως ).

The Lucan passage clearly refers to the deliverance of the saints at the coming of the Son of Man. Rom. 8:23 implies that acceptance into God's family ( υἱοθεσία ) is synonymous with the "redemption of the body" and that this desire for adoption and freedom is at one with a universal longing, expressed in v. 21 "The creation will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty

<sup>1</sup> C. Spicq, L'Épître aux Hébreux (Paris, 1952) vol. 1, p. 306 admits that one may understand Heb. 9:12, 15 in terms of the typology of liberation from the Egyptian slavery, the type of all spiritual deliverance. The accent, he says, is on the idea of liberation rather than on price. But cf. vol. 2 p. 257 on 9:12 "le sang est le prix du rachat".



of the children of God (ἐλευθερία)". The content of this desire is paralleled by the hope of Christians: their adoption is the entering into the glorious liberty and the redemption of their bodies is the setting free from decay at the Resurrection (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45-9). If this is the correct interpretation, ἀπολύτρωσις clearly means "liberation" or "deliverance from all the ills to which the flesh is heir."<sup>1</sup> Eph. 4:30 refers to the day of final deliverance, the future consummation of faith and Christian living, with emancipation from the power of evil in all its forms. There is no idea of price attaching to these occurrences of ἀπολύτρωσις. We find it difficult to accept the view of Warfield (followed by Morris) which keeps alive the notion of ransom in these passages by interpreting them as referring to the ultimate effects of the ransoming wrought by Jesus in his death, and not to some new or different ransoming. "There is no specifically eschatological sense of ἀπολύτρωσις, there is only an eschatological application of the ransoming which has been wrought by Christ's gift of himself"<sup>2</sup> It is true that, in Christian faith, final redemption is related to the work of Calvary, but the relation is to be seen in terms of the common theme of deliverance, not in terms of one particular

<sup>1</sup> Sanday and Headlam, Commentary on Romans, ICC, (Edinburgh, 1895) p.209.

<sup>2</sup> Warfield, op.cit., pp.239-40 n.71.



explanation of Christ's liberating death. Warfield is guilty of assuming that he can import into his interpretation of the meaning of ἀπολύτρωσις in one context (eschatological) the ideas which he thinks are central to its meaning in a different (atonement) context.

We come now to Eph.1:7: "In him (Christ) we have the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν) through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses", with which we may consider Col.1:14 "In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins". Typical of many comments made on Eph.1:7 is that by F.F.Bruce in his recent commentary:

The word implies that our former existence was one of slavery from which we required to be ransomed. The ransom price is expressly mentioned (as it is not in the best-authenticated texts of the parallel passage in Col.1:14): it was a price of immeasurable costliness, nothing less than the blood of Christ. If, even under the shadowy economy of the Levitical ritual, sacrificial blood was accepted for the worshipper's atonement "by reason of the life" (Lev. 17:11), then the price at which our emancipation was purchased was the infinitely more acceptable life of the Incarnate Son. . 1

The claim that ἀπολύτρωσις possesses a ransom content is here based on the interpretation of διὰ αἵματος as "at the price of his blood". Confidence in this interpretation may, however, be shaken by consideration of the following points:

(1) the preposition διὰ may mean simply "through" or "by means of" (instrumental); neither in classical, Koine, nor

1 Epistle to the Ephesians, (Pickering and Inglis; London, 1961) ad loc. p.31.



LXX Greek is it used to express cost: (ii) even in a context of sacrificial ideas, the shedding of blood is hardly to be regarded as the price paid for the release from sins;<sup>1</sup> neither in OT thought nor in modern discussion is sacrifice interpreted in terms of ransom; even if we seek the rationale of sacrifice in Lev.17:11 (which Bruce quotes) we are probably in the realm of substitutionary ideas, but not those of ransom. Moreover, in the verse under discussion, the apparent explanation of "redemption through his blood" by the phrase "the forgiveness of sins" suggests that the author is interested in the releasing nature and effects of the atoning death rather than in a theory concerning its ransom significance. At Col.1:14 the noun ἀπολύτρωσις (without the addition of διὰ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ) is again virtually equated with "the forgiveness of sins". The verse follows the statement that "He (God) has delivered us (ἐρρύσατο ) from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the Kingdom of his beloved Son". It

<sup>1</sup> The use of "blood" in the NT probably implies more than death: it has the active connotation of life as well, based possibly on the view of the life-force set free in sacrifice in order that it may be effective for the benefit of others, whether to expiate sins or to communicate the divine blessing to men. Cf. W.D. Davies, PRJ (2 ed. London, 1955) p.234; V. Taylor, Jesus and his Sacrifice, (London, 1937), p.54 and W.O.E. Oosterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, (London, 1937), p.224. For the view that "blood" means only death, see J. Bahm, TWNT Vol.1 p.173 and Leon Morris, JTS (n.s.) III, Oct. 1952, pp.216-227 and The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, (London, 1955) pp.108ff.



seems to us that the two terms, redemption and forgiveness, carry on the theme of that verse: ἀπολύτρωσις is the emancipation or rescue from the powers of darkness, and ἄφεσις is the character of the deliverance, namely a freeing from sin.<sup>1</sup> Taking the contexts into account, we do not think it correct to assume that the idea of ransom is expressed or implied in the use of the word ἀπολύτρωσις at Eph.1:7 and Col. 1:14.

At Eph. 1:14 we have the strange phrase ". . the Holy Spirit, which is the guarantee of our inheritance εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως ". The RSV interprets this as "until we acquire possession of it", thus referring περιποίησις to our possession of the inheritance. The NEB offers a better rendering "until God has redeemed what is His own", the word περιποίησις connoting our lives as God's possession. The future reference contained in the phrase recalls Rom.8:23 and it is probable that ἀπολύτρωσις is to be understood here, as there, of the final deliverance from evil into the fulness of the life to come.

At 1 Cor.1:30 Paul demonstrates the true character of wisdom. The revelation of divine wisdom lies in what the intellectual world would call folly, viz. the Cross of

<sup>1</sup> The precise definition of the redemption or deliverance as being the forgiveness of sins may have been made to counter some doctrine of the Colossian false teachers, such as the possibility of an escape into immortality without a corresponding change in character, cf. C.F.D. Moule in Colossians and Philemon (Cambridge, 1957) ad loc.



Christ. This wisdom is not composed of intellectual knowledge but of "righteousness, sanctification and redemption ἀπολύτρωσις )"1 It may be possible to regard these as the three consequences of the death of Christ, i.e. a setting right of man with God, sanctification through union with him and redemption as the deliverance from sin. On the other hand, one may interpret them of the progress in Christian living, i.e. the initial justification or setting right, the process of sanctification and the final deliverance into the life to come. Whichever view we adopt it is important to notice that there is nothing here which obliges us to see in ἀπολύτρωσις a reference to a specific ransom understanding of Christ's death. If we are prepared to interpret NT language in terms of Biblical Greek usage, it would appear wise not to read a ransom-theology of the Atonement out of the mere occurrence of the words ἀπολύτρωσις etc., unless there is in association with them something which clearly implies (as in 1 Pet.1:18) a price paid. The less precise meaning "deliverance" and "deliver" is well established in the LXX and other sources.

The context surrounding the appearance of ἀπο-  
λύτρωσις at Rom.3:24 presents many problems for the exegete, not the least important of which is the interpre-

1 It seems best to take the three terms as explanatory of "wisdom" rather than co-ordinate with it: so Robertson and Plummer, Corinthians, ICC (E'burgh, 1918) p.27, and J. Moffatt, 1 Corinthians, MNTC (London, 1938) on 1:30.



tation of ἱλαστήριον at v.25. In the study of this word presented in this work, we have suggested the possibility of interpreting it in terms of the atoning and propitiatory value of the deaths of the Maccabean martyrs, rather than in terms of the Levitical ritual of the Day of Atonement. We would not claim that this is a final interpretation of the word, but it does seem to us that the Pauline understanding of the death of Christ may very well owe something to the Jewish idea of the atoning power of the death of the righteous, and particularly of the righteous martyr. If this is the case, does it help us in our attempt to explain ἀπολύτρωσις at v.24: δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον..? The summary statement on the death of the seven brothers which effected the release of Israel (4 Mac.17:22) refers to it as ὡς περ ἀντίψυχον, and the death of Eleazar is similarly described at 6:29. Some translators of these passages render the word by "ransom", and this would support the claim that ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom.3 (still assuming the influence of the Maccabees passage) means "deliverance by the payment of a ransom price". But is ἀντίψυχον accurately translated by "ransom"? The reference concerning Eleazar suggests that a more correct rendering is "substitute"<sup>1</sup> i.e. "Take my life as a substitute for

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Buchsel, TNT, vol. 3, p.323 on the event; "Only through substitutionary suffering, through personal self-offering, is the community atoned".



theirs". May we interpret ἀντίψυχον ... τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας in the same way? It would be senseless to regard the phrase as meaning "a substitute for the sins of the people", but may not H.W. Robinson be right in explaining it as "a substitute for the life forfeited by the sin of the people"?<sup>1</sup> The people's sin deserved the penalty of death, but the seven brothers became their substitute. Now if this is the correct interpretation of the ἀντίψυχον which brought about the divine deliverance of Israel, then (still assuming the influence of 4 Mac. on Romans 3) the ἀπολύτρωσις will connote, at most, deliverance through the substitutionary death of Christ, the emphasis being all the time on liberation.

If the hypothesis of the influence of the accounts of the Maccabaeen martyrs on Romans 3 does not commend itself, what view is to be taken of the meaning of ἀπολύτρωσις? T.W. Manson speaks of "emancipation" and "restoration to true ownership";<sup>2</sup> C.H. Dodd sees it as a metaphor taken from the institution of slavery (that of justification being taken from the law-courts and that of "expiation by blood" from the sacrificial ritual).<sup>3</sup> This

1 The Cross of the Servant, (London; 1926) pp. 58ff.

2 New Peake: Romans para. 819a, p.943.

3 Romans, MNTC (London 1932) p.56. "God takes the part.. of the benefactor who secures freedom for the slave". Dodd stresses the effects of the action i.e. the emancipation, not the transactional element.



latter interpretation may recall Deissmann's emphasis on the indebtedness of Paul to the language associated with the manumission of slaves, and it must be admitted that this meaning (involving the notion of payment, without which manumission was not granted) would readily come to the minds of readers familiar with current usage of the term. If, on the other hand, we stress the Biblical character of Paul's Greek, we will emphasise the image of Israel's deliverance from captivity by the power of God, their recovery into God's rightful ownership, without the idea of payment. The two approaches do not lead to opposing interpretations. The central idea is that of liberation effected by Christ's death: in him we have freedom from the state of slavery in which our sins put us. It is doubtful if Paul intended to imply the precise theory of release by ransom when he used the word ἀπολύτρωσις .

The word ἀντίλυτρον occurs once in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim.2:6 speaks of Christ as he "who gave himself ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων ". The noun λύτρον in Biblical Greek means "the ransom paid to gain freedom" or "the means by which release is achieved": the preposition here emphasises the notion of substitution and Leon Morris claims that it is a "substitute-ransom" which is signified.<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> The only known examples of the word outside Scripture are much later.

<sup>2</sup> Morris, The Apostolic Preaching, p.48.



view of our discussion up to this point, we may find it difficult to assume such precision of meaning.<sup>1</sup> The verse closely resembles Mark 10:45 and the words may be a citation or a reminiscence of a primitive creedal formula. To the consideration of the Markan verse we now turn. Our understanding of 1 Tim.2:6 may be clarified by it.

Mark 10:45: The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many ( λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ).

The problems of this verse fall under three heads: (i) the genuineness of the saying, (ii) its meaning and (iii) its background of interpretation.

(i) The authenticity of the saying has been assailed (a) on the grounds that the critical words about ransom are absent from the parallel passage in Luke 22:26-7: Luke, however, is reporting a similar, not the same, incident as Mark; and his v.27 may be an independent saying altogether, whereas Mk.10:45 is integral to its context and has Semitic form and structure: (b) because it looks like an addition due to Pauline influence: we would observe however that Paul never uses λύτρον and that the category of redemption is not so common in his teaching as one might think; moreover, we ought to remember that, as V.Taylor justly says, "Paulinism was rooted in primitive Christianity";<sup>2</sup> (c) because the

<sup>1</sup> NEB renders "Christ sacrificed himself to win freedom for all mankind".

<sup>2</sup> The Gospel according to St Mark, (London, 1952) p.446. Père Lagrange pertinently asks: "Jesus a-t-il fourni le thème



λύτρον idea is absent from the Gospels elsewhere and is out of harmony with its context: but the unusualness of the theme in the Gospels may mean no more than that it is not the central point in Jesus' teaching about his death; and the claim that the idea of sacrificing life itself on behalf of others is out of harmony with the theme of service indicates a very strange logic; self-sacrifice is indeed the crown of service to others. It is certainly true that we cannot prove beyond all doubt the authenticity of any word which tradition has ascribed to Jesus, but there is no sufficient reason, in our view, to doubt that Jesus could and did refer to his death, in the terms of this saying at Mark 10:45.

(ii) What do these terms mean? In both Biblical and non-Biblical usage the prevailing notion behind the word λύτρον is that of the price paid as a ransom for which liberation is achieved, something given in order to gain or regain freedom. The word is seldom used with ἀντὶ, and this preposition, bearing here its most common meaning, "Instead of" or "in place of", stresses the substitutionary character of the λύτρον <sup>1</sup>( ἀντὶ πολλῶν depends on λύτρον

aux développements de Paul, ou Mc. a-t-il condensé en un mot la théologie de Paul pour la prêter à Jésus?" and he replies "La première hypothèse est la seule vraisemblable", Evangile selon Saint Marc (6th ed. Paris, 1942) p.283.

<sup>1</sup> That the substitutionary emphasis belongs to the phrase λύτρον ἀντὶ can be demonstrated from Jos.Ant. 14.107 which describes the attempt made (in 54 B.C.) by the priest



not on δοῦναι ). The use of πολλῶν (a non-Pauline idiom in connection with the efficacy of Christ's death) contrasts the sacrifice of the one with the others for whom it is made and therefore is here tantamount to "all". It is scarcely possible to inquire into the meaning of λύτρον in this verse without taking it in conjunction with ἀντὶ πολλῶν : these two words give to the term a definite substitutionary content. For a proper understanding of the phrase, however, we must seek the background of thought to which the verse points.

(iii) Almost all commentators on Mark 10:45 have assumed that its background of thought is to be found in the great Suffering Servant passage, Is.52:13-53:12. Recently C.K. Barrett has subjected this claim to careful scrutiny.<sup>1</sup> He concludes from his study of the language that "it would be difficult indeed, on the basis of it (i.e. language) to claim that Mark's words point clearly to Isaiah 53 rather than to any other part of the OT and Jewish literature".<sup>2</sup> One of the strongest points in favour of his case

Eleazar to buy off Crassus: "He gave him a bar of gold λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων " i.e. in the hope that he would take it instead of all the other things he might have taken. What was offered was given as a substitute, not exacted as a ransom price.

1 New Testament Essays for T.W. Manson (Manchester, 1959) pp. 1-18. Cf. also M.D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, (London, 1959) pp.74ff.

2 Barrett, op.cit. p.7.



is that the term λύτρον and 'asham (Is.53:10) which it is generally thought to represent, are not equivalents: λύτρον and its cognate words never represent 'asham, and 'asham is never rendered by any of the λύτρον -words; in fact the ideas represented by the two words are quite different.<sup>1</sup> We find Barrett's examination of the linguistic evidence for the dependence of the saying on Isaiah entirely convincing, but we must add that even if the language of the logion does not recall the exact words of Isaiah 53, the ideas expressed in the Suffering Servant passage are certainly echoed in the Markan verse. It would be unwise to claim that there is nothing common to the Servant song and Mark 10:45 because the words used are not the same. It is our opinion that the general background of thought of the Markan logion is to be found in a theme at once wider than that of the Servant, yet including it, namely, the Jewish theme of the suffering righteous, described in Wisdom 2-5 and earlier in many Psalms.<sup>2</sup> The various strands

<sup>1</sup> Barrett (op.cit.) claims that λύτρον involves the idea of equivalence, while the 'asham does not, since it was not a compensation. This is, in general, true: the act of restitution was distinguished from the 'asham sacrifice (Lev.5:14-26). But at Num.5:7-8 'asham is used for "restitution of what is wrongly possessed", a sense found nowhere else. In interpreting the word, however, the habitual meaning is the one with which to deal, rather than the unusual.

<sup>2</sup> E.Schweitzer has appealed to this theme as providing the pattern of Jesus' life in Lordship and Discipleship. (SCM: London,1960) and in NTS, vol.2 (1956-57) pp.87-99. He does not accept Mk.10:45 as an authentic word of Jesus.



of this theme - righteousness, obedience, suffering, vindication, exaltation - are present in the picture of the Isaianic Servant, with a significant addition: the sufferings of the Servant (Israel or a remnant within Israel) are vicarious. Now the expression of this dimension of suffering within the Servant Songs probably contributed to the development, within our general theme, of the idea of the representative, atoning value of the suffering and death of the righteous, and particularly of martyrs. At an earlier stage of this work we have given some examples of this idea and drawn attention to the profound statement of it in connection with the Maccabean martyrdoms, 2 Mac. 7:37; 4 Mac. 6:28 and 17:21-22.<sup>1</sup> There the lives of the seven brothers are regarded as the substitute for the lives forfeited by the sin of the nation: their self-sacrifice would form a means of atonement for Israel as a whole and would win mercy and deliverance.<sup>2</sup>

If then the background of Mk.10:45 is to be found in the Jewish belief in the atoning suffering of the righteous, how are we to understand the word λύτρον? In the first place, it is not the 'asham of Is.53:10, although its effects may be the same. Secondly, it cannot be inter-

<sup>1</sup> Above, pp. 63f., 114.

<sup>2</sup> It is perhaps noteworthy that the language of these passages is echoed in Mk.10:45 προσίδωμι ψύχην / δοῦναι τὴν ψύχην : ἀντίψυχον / λύτρον .



preted as "ransom" in the strict sense of the word, for the sacrifice of the righteous which gained deliverance for others was not a price paid, but a representative action accepted as having atoning value. Yet the word cannot be rendered here simply by "means of deliverance" because, by its relation to the OT kopher and the later kapparah, as well as by the words ἀντὶ πολλῶν, a precise means is indicated, namely, substitutionary atonement. Bearing in mind both its context and the background of thought suggested, we would submit that the most adequate understanding of λύτρον is "atoning substitute".<sup>1</sup>

Jesus took upon himself the redemptive mission given by God to his people. He accomplished it and led it to its goal, in his life as well as in his death. For he lived as the righteous remnant, as a substitute for the whole nation, revealing in himself what Israel should have been. In bringing this mission to its final and complete accomplishment, he laid down his life, trusting that God would be well-pleased to see His regal claims fulfilled in the one great action of obedient service, which was Jesus' life and death, and would grant to the whole nation deliverance and renewal.

<sup>1</sup> J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom", JTS, XIV, (1963) pp. 279-93, brings Mk. 10:45 and other NT passages into relation with the Jewish doctrine of atonement through martyrdom. He thinks that this category of Jewish theology was adopted by the early Church to expound the meaning of Jesus' death because Jesus used it himself.



### VIII. Concluding Summary

This study of the λύτρον -words and the conclusions reached exemplify clearly the importance of giving due consideration to the Biblical character of New Testament Greek. If we interpret the words on the basis of the meaning which they had in Classical Greek and in the language of the non-literary papyri, then the emphasis will lie on the element of payment and price. Many scholars have thus interpreted them, and thereby laid the foundation for the ransom theory of the Atonement with its inevitable difficulties, e.g. to whom was the price paid? If we come to the interpretation of the terms with an understanding of their use and development of meaning in Biblical Greek (and of their Hebrew equivalents), our conclusions will be different. Outside the legal portions of the Old Testament, the relevant words have weakened in meaning into the less precise idea of "deliverance" and "means of release", without reference to ransom-payment. It is this looser and more general sense of λυτρόομαι etc. which is most evident in the Greek version and is taken over by the New Testament writers in their use of the verb and cognate nouns. Only when the context expresses or clearly implies a payment made to gain freedom (as at 1 Pet. 1:18) will it be wise to interpret the terms in the strict sense of ransom. The New Testament authors emphasise the idea of freedom and deliverance (after



the pattern of the great deliverances of Israel) and do not intend to convey by the use of the λύτρον word-complex a particular theory concerning the sacrifice and death of Jesus. The nearest approach to this is Mark 10.45: but there the meaning of λύτρον is largely governed by the words ἅντι πολλῶν which possess a clear substitutionary connotation.

In this study, then, we discover some of those principles on which a sound approach to Biblical semantics may be based. First of all, there is the importance for interpretation of the immediate linguistic context, and of what we referred to earlier as the "historical context", i.e. the special content and associations which the word gathered in the course of its history. Secondly we may see the value of attempting to discover the actual life-situation or thought-reference within which the word was predominantly used and possessed meaning. Then - and this is probably very significant - we realise that λύτρον and its Hebrew counterparts are important theological terms, relating to God's action in saving his people. We cannot fully understand these words without penetrating beyond matters of usage to the whole field of meaning to which they point, i.e. to the experience of Israel recollected, described by the prophets, and then providing the language with which God's new freemen could refer to their deliverance in Christ.



THE BACKGROUND AND USAGE OF ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ  
and cognate words in Biblical Greek.

	Page
I.    הַצְדָּקָה and related words in the Old Testament	143
Observations on the Semantics of the <u>sdq</u> -words	168
II.   Δίκαιος   and related words in Greek Usage	174
Appended note on G. Schrenk's study of ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ	183
III. The Septuagint	187
IV.   The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	197
V.    Philo Judaeus	199
VI.   The Dead Sea Scrolls	202
VII. The Rabbinic Literature	211
VIII. The Δίκαιος - words in the New Testament	222
Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels	222
Part 2. Paul	238



# I. קדח and related words in the Old Testament.

It may be regarded as an obstacle to any attempt to define the meaning of קדח and related words in the OT that the original significance of the root sdq appears to be irrevocably lost. Nevertheless, the fact that a root-meaning is unknown does not hinder interpretation on the basis of usage; and, as a matter of semantic principle, usage remains ultimately decisive for meaning, even when the etymological significance of a word can be established with certainty.

The use and meaning of the root outside the Hebrew language.

1. A very ancient example of the use of sdq has been found in the 14th century Ugaritic epic of Keret (line 12), where it refers to right relationship, 'att. sdqh meaning "legitimate, rightful or proper wife", and being parallel to mtrht ysrh, "legal spouse".<sup>1</sup> A similar judicial sense is attested in the Tel el-Amarna tablets (No.287.32f.) where Abdi-Hiba, though corresponding in Accadian, makes use of the cognate Canaanite term saduk in order to affirm that he has dealt in the right way with the Cushites: sa-du-uk a-na ia-a-si / as-sum améluti ka-si-wi ("I am in the right with regard to the Kasi people."<sup>2</sup>). 2. Another early

<sup>1</sup> C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature (Rome, 1949) p.67 and J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, (Leiden, 1957), Supp.VT, no.5, pp. 94ff. At Text 32.5 Gordon reads (s)dq kttn "thou shalt admit the right".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna Tafeln (Leipzig, 1908-15) and



example (c. 12th century) appears, but with a rather different meaning, in the Phoenician epigraphic texts of Byblus. The inscription of Yehimelek contains a plea that his life should be prolonged on the ground that he is "a righteous and upright king (מלך צדק ומלך ישר)"<sup>1</sup> The term apparently connotes the quality of his rule, rather than its legitimacy. In this connection, we must take account of the early application of the root to divine beings. The ancient traditions of Jerusalem speak of Melchizedek (Gen.14:18) and of Adonizedek (Jos.10:1; cf. Jud.1:5-7). On the analogy of other early names of this type it is suggested that the Zedek-part should be construed as a divine name embodying the ideal which the term implies, the name thus meaning "My King or My Lord is Z(S)edek". On the other hand, it is possible that it should be construed like the name Jehozadak ("Yahu is righteous"), to give the

S.A.B. Mercer, Tel el-Amarna Tablets, (Toronto, 1939) ad loc. C.J. Mullo Weir, (Documents from OT Times, ed. D.W. Thomas, (London, 1958, p.39) and W.F. Albright (Ancient Near East, ed. J.B. Pritchard, Princeton and Oxford, 1958, p.271) punctuate the passage differently: "Behold, O King, my Lord, I am in the right. With reference to the Cushites..." The meaning of saduk, however, is scarcely affected. Weir and Albright's interpretation makes the word refer to Abdi-Hiba's innocence of charges of disloyalty in the annexation of land, while the older interpretation refers it to his treatment of the Cushites.

1 Cf. M. Dunand, RB, XXXIX (1930) p.321. He finds sdq in a similar context and with the same connotation in the Yehawmelek inscription, 1:9, which is dated some five centuries later. See also A. Dupont-Sommer, Semitica, III, (1950) pp. 35-44.



meaning "My (The) Lord or king is righteous". Likewise the Ugaritic name Sdk-il may mean "Sdk is (my) God" or "Il (El) is righteous". In either case, its use in personal names suggests the very early association of sdq with deity, probably with reference to the quality of governing, though the (judicial) interpretation "My Lord or King is the right one" is not impossible. 3. The root appears in Arabic with a variety of meanings: it may denote what is right or what is firm and stable and therefore substantial. And when a date is called tsdq it must simply mean that it is "as it should be", a "right" date.

On the basis of these illustrations of early usage it is difficult to assert with definiteness a single primary meaning of the root. Probably the most we can say is that they suggest that the fundamental idea of sdq available to us is that of conformity to a norm which remains to be defined in each particular case.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Old Testament Usage

Bearing in mind, then, the fact that the root sdq was not a creation of Biblical Hebrew but had undergone earlier semantic development, we turn to the OT usage. Beginning with occurrences which are not directly religious and theological, we find that the term  $\text{סֶדֶק}$  is used in the construct state with "balances", "weights" etc. (Lev.19:36; Ezek.45:10)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Kautzsch, Die Derivate des Stammes tsdq im altt. Sprachgebrauch, (Tübingen, 1881.)



and adjectivally with "measure" (Deut.25:15), and clearly connotes conformity to proper standards. The balances etc. are to be as they should be, i.e. "correct", or in common English speech, "right".<sup>1</sup> The sacrifices of Deut.33:19 and Psalms 4:5; 51:19 are the "correct" sacrifices, those which conform to the ritual regulations. The same idea is found in Gen.38:26 where the obligatory standard is established customary law. When Judah says of Tamar, "She is more righteous (  $\text{נְקִיָּה}$  ) than I", he is referring, not to ethical uprightness, but rather to the strength of her case in terms of the levirate marriage law: with reference to a particular act and a particular convention, Judah can say, "She is 'in the right' as against me". This may be properly called a forensic or judicial meaning, without necessarily implying that a law-suit is actually brought before a judge. If, however, this action were to take place, the person who is "righteous" is the person who is "in the right" and in whose favour the judge would make his decision, cf. Exod.23:7.<sup>2</sup> These examples of the concrete meaning of the root are in accord with its use in the Tel el-Amarna and Ras-Shamra texts and support our contention

<sup>1</sup> The only case where the Niph'al of the verb is used - "the holy place  $\text{נִקְּחָה}$  (LXX  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  ), Dan.8:14, should probably be interpreted along these lines, i.e. "the holy place shall be put right, or restored."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W.R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel, (2nd ed. London, 1897) p.71, "Righteous is to the Hebrew not so much a moral quality as a legal status."



that sdq basically connotes conformity to a norm, but not an absolute ethical norm by which all behaviour may be measured, nor an ideal standard of "rightness" for objects. The norm was conceived to be furnished by the objective standard of the thing itself: and in cases where the term is applied to persons, the rightness or righteousness of conduct depends on the actual circumstances and the demands which arise from them, and not on some universal standard.<sup>1</sup>

Saddiq is somebody or something that is as he or it should be; the meaning of the word is "real", "pure", "true", that which agrees with the end to which it has been created, that which inwardly, fundamentally, corresponds to its external appearance, and therefore actually fulfils the function for which (he) it exists.

2

It might indeed be claimed that sdq is a formal term, the content of which can only be characterised with reference to the particular situation within which it is applied. In this, it is similar to the English use of the word "just" or "right". For instance, Tamar is the "righteous" one in circumstances which refer to the levirate marriage custom: at 1 Sam.24:17 David is more righteous ( דָּקִיָּם ) than Saul with reference to the duty of non-violence to the Lord's anointed: and at Ezek.16:52, Samaria and Sodom are more "in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, (Eng.tr.by J.A. Baker, London, 1961) pp.240-41, and G. von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Munich, 1957) Band 1, pp.388ff.

<sup>2</sup> Th.C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, (Eng. tr. Oxford, 1958) p.327.



the right" (RSV) at judgment than Jerusalem, because the number of their sins is less.

It is not only convention or law, however, which is regarded as the norm by which the measure of "rightness" may be judged: there is, in Israel's thought, a wider, and perhaps more basic, idea of what constituted the norm. At the heart of the Israelite understanding of life lies the consciousness of a community relation.<sup>1</sup> As is the case also in other tribal societies, the Israelite possessed a strong awareness of an allegiance to the family, tribal, and later the national unit. He regarded himself less as an individual with individual rights than as a member of a group, under obligation to fulfil the demands and laws which make for the well-being and good-ordering of the particular social unit. Actions and behaviour which correspond to or are true to the claims arising out of the social relation (between two or more persons) may be referred to as ḥṣḏ.<sup>2</sup> The community relation itself, so to

1 Cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, I-II (London, 1926). The sociological studies of M. Weber (Religionssoziologie, III: Das antike Judentum) confirm his view. See K. A. Fahlgren, Sedaka, (Uppsala, 1932) pp. 78ff.

2 H. Cremer, Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutest. Gräzität (7th ed. Gotha, 1893) p. 273: "Jedes Verhältnis bringt bestimmte Ansprüche an den Verhalten mit sich, und die Befriedigung dieser Ansprüche, welche sich aus dem Verhältnis ergeben und bei welcher allein das Verhältnis bestehen kann, wird mit unserem Begriff (ḥṣḏ) bezeichnet". Cf. E. R. Achtemeier, IDB vol. 4 p. 80 "ḥṣḏ is a concept of relationship and he who is righteous has fulfilled the demands laid upon him by the relationship in which he stands."



1  
speak, becomes the norm: that which obeys its demands and thus preserves society is recognised as נִצְּחָה.<sup>2</sup> But one community relationship stands supreme above all others in the Israelite consciousness, that of the Covenant relation which Yahweh established with the people of his choice. The importance of this relationship for the interpretation of the meaning of personal and community righteousness and of the righteousness of Yahweh is emphasised by all recent OT theologians, and will be evident in this discussion. The covenant idea is an explanation or interpretation of events within Israel's history: to characterise them and their significance men drew upon categories and terms with which they were familiar.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore not surprising that the use of sdq as applied to Yahweh and to the covenant-people should reflect the notions which were associated with the term apart from that particular relationship. Consequently Eichrodt can say:

In the case of Yahweh, his righteousness implies the same kind of right conduct which in Israel upholds

1 Because the obligations to and within a community depend on social milieu, a change from one social pattern to another influences the character of the obligations and results in a changing standard of "rightness", in law and conduct.

2 In exceptional circumstances, the individual might, out of loyalty to his understanding of the divine purpose, stand over against the community, ceasing to identify himself with its assumed נִצְּחָה.

3 The whole idea and its formulation reflect the form of ancient suzerainty treaties between kings and peoples (cf. G.E. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient



the law by means of judicial procedure: the justice appropriate to Israel on her side is determined by her position as the covenant people, in virtue of which she can count on the intervention of the divine assistance in any danger which threatens that position.

1

We must now examine the two elements suggested in this statement: the root sdq as used of Yahweh and of the people.

1. The application of sdq to Yahweh.

The influence on Hebrew usage of sdq as a title or qualitative description of Canaanite deities is impossible to assess. Some think that Sedeq plays an active and personal role in certain Psalms (88:11,12,14; 89:15; 97:2) and that this name refers either to a primitive god become Yahweh's servant or to the hypostatisation of the attribute of one great god - both possibilities implying Canaanite influence. Whether this is so or not is difficult to say, but it does seem probable, remembering the early use of the word as descriptive of the king, that its appearance with reference to a god or gods reflects the early connection of the idea of kingship with the gods, a connection so close that the gods assumed the functions of the true king. This association (king and god) was part of Israel's inheritance and there is good reason to believe that the characterisation Near East, Pittsburgh, 1955, reprinted from Biblical Archaeologist, XVII, 1954). The name סִדְקָא was in use to describe a relation of mutual obligations and demands.

1 Eichrodt, op.cit., pp.241-42.



of Yahweh's kingship as sdq reflects the meaning of the term as applied to the judgments, activity and character of the true king.<sup>1</sup>

The work of A.R. Johnson and others has been of immense value in demonstrating the importance of the position of the king in Israel's thought and religious ritual. In him the nation, as a psychical whole, found its focus: on him it depended for its right-ordering and well-being (וְיָשִׁיבָם), since it was his concern to see that the life of the total society and all relations within it were "as they should be", i.e. were such as to maintain and promote national unity and prosperity. This is the וְיָשִׁיבָם of the society: in bringing it about, the king is himself וְיָשִׁיבָם, both with reference to the manner of his performing his functions, as well as to his personal character. Among the functions of the king, there is one which is of importance for an adequate understanding of the "righteousness" of Yahweh, namely, the king's judicial activity. That the functions of the judge devolved upon the king is obvious when we remember that his concern for the right ordering of the community's life necessitated his restraining individuals from doing "what was right in their own eyes,"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A.R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, (Cardiff, 1955) pp.1-7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jud.17:6 "in those days there was no king in Israel, every man did what was right in his own eyes".



thus breaking the cohesiveness of the nation. To this end, he was the one supremely devoted to seeing that the sanctions of the group, particularly the nation's laws, were uniformly observed throughout the different strata of society. In the event of a dispute, one might go to him, in his judicial capacity, for a ruling or judgment (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּט}$  ): the pronouncement, however, was not a matter of the impartial application of a formal standard of justice, but of rightly satisfying the claims brought before him. As arbiter he "declared in the right" (  $\text{וַיִּצְדֵּק}$  ) him who was "in the right" (  $\text{וַיִּצְדֵּק}$  ), and condemned him who was "in the wrong" (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁפֹּט}$  ), cf. Deut.16:18; 25:1; Lev.19:15, the norm being provided by the situation, considered from the point of view of the general welfare of the community. Now this endeavour to promote the  $\text{וַיִּצְדֵּק}$  of the community, to create a state of affairs in which every relationship was "as it should be", appears to be the correct point of departure for the understanding of the peculiar character of justice in Israel and in the ancient Near East generally. For one section of the community, however, things were almost always not "as they should be", the section variously known as the "poor", the "needy" or the "weak", and among whom

1 The root  $\text{שׁוּט}$  has had a development in many ways parallel to that of  $\text{צָדַק}$ . The Hiphil means "to decide against one", "to condemn". In view of its associations the root came to have the general ethical meaning "wicked". Probably the meaning of  $\text{שׁוּט}$  is, in certain cases, best gauged by the meaning of  $\text{צָדַק}$ , which is its opposite.



were numbered the widow and orphan. These were the down-trodden who had no means of redress: their only hope lay with the upholder of  $\text{הַיָּדֵי}$ , by whose righteous judgments they were not only declared "in the right", but were assisted and protected. Now it is interesting to observe that this characteristic of judicial righteousness - the special concern for the depressed - was not new in Israel. The great law-code of Hammurabi (1700 B.C.) affirms this royal responsibility in its prologue (I.27ff, V.15f) and epilogue (rev.XXIV.59f.): and it is attested as the ideal of Canaanite kingship by the Keret epic, in which the king's son thus chides his father:

Thou hast let thy hand fall slack:  
Thou dost not judge the cause of the widow  
Or adjudicate in the cause of the feeble,  
Or drive away such as oppress the poor;  
Thou dost not feed the orphans before thee  
Or the widow behind thy back. 1

An early Israelite illustration of this royal duty towards the oppressed is found at 2 Sam.15:1-6. Noteworthy among the many occurrences of the theme is Psalm 72:1-2, 12-14, a "royal" psalm in which the basic thought is that of the king watching over the rights of all his subjects and ensuring that, according to their need, the weaker members of society enjoy his protection. This does not mean that there was one law for the rich and another for the poor, or

I Cf. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, p.82 .



that the weak received preferential treatment, (cf. Deut.1: 16f.; Lev.19:15). The fact of the matter simply was that these unfortunates were not receiving equal treatment: they had their right taken away from them: consequently, that balance on which the right order of the community rested required redress in their favour. This bias in favour of the poor and needy in the meaning of the word  $\text{חַסְדִּים}$ <sup>1</sup> is the beginning of the development by which it came to denote "mercy", "benevolence" and "almsgiving" in post-Biblical Hebrew and in Aramaic.

Such was the meaning and character of the "righteousness" of the king. From it we return to the discussion of the "righteousness" of Yahweh, King of Israel and of all nations; and there the same ideas are substantially reflected. If the king was responsible for the right ordering of Israel's life by seeing that laws were obeyed and well-being enjoyed, how much more was this the concern of Yahweh, from whom these laws drew their existence and importance, and on whom the nation ultimately depended for its creation and continuance. Accordingly, not only is the norm by which the nation's  $\text{חַסְדִּים}$  may be determined provided by the Covenant and its responsibilities, but in fact these are regarded, in some measure, in Israel's thought,

<sup>1</sup> This was recognised by the LXX which translates  $\text{חַסְדִּים}$  occasionally by  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  (Ezek.18:19,21; Ps.33:5) and  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron$ - $\omicron\upsilon\nu\eta$  (Dan.4:27).



as normative for Yahweh's צדק<sup>1</sup>. In other words, when both sides, Yahweh and his people, are fulfilling their obligations to one another, things are "ideally" as they should be. It seems that it is by some such line of thought as this that sdq develops towards the meaning "victory" or "triumph". This took place at a very early stage, since in the oldest Hebrew text in the Bible, the Song of Deborah (c. 12th century) we read of צדקות יהוה (LXX δίκαιο-  
συνας) Jud. 5:11, with reference to victory in battle. When Israel's life was threatened from outside by enemies, Yahweh could be expected to intervene on her behalf out of his loyalty to the covenant: that the relationship should be maintained was, in this case, his responsibility and the nation's success in warfare was consequently the proof of his צדק. The idiom remains in the later period, as at 1 Sam.12:7 and Micah 6:15, where the צדקות יהוה may be interpreted as the "righteous or saving acts" which Yahweh performed for his people out of faithfulness to his covenant.

The "righteousness" of Yahweh reflects more clearly the character of the king's "righteousness" in its frequent reference to his judicial function.<sup>2</sup> As judge, it

<sup>1</sup> Achteimer, op.cit. p.82, "Yahweh's righteousness is his fulfilment of the demands of the relationship which exists between him and his people Israel, his fulfilment of the covenant which he has made with his chosen nation".

<sup>2</sup> The court-room scenes in Deutero-Isaiah where Y. appears as judge and as spokesman for Israel's case, illustrate this. At 41:21ff. Y. is proclaimed as צדק ("in the right") where the question is "Who has the power to control the



is Yahweh<sup>1</sup> who supremely distinguishes between those who are "in the right" and those who are "in the wrong"; he condemns the latter and "puts in the right" (Hiphil of פָּדָא = "acquit" or "declare to be in the right") the former.<sup>2</sup> Just as the righteous judgment of the king took on a special character when it was directed towards the poor and needy, so with the "righteousness" of Yahweh. He not only "puts in the right" the weak and oppressed, but it is to him supremely that they look for help (cf. Ps.10;14; 72:12). In establishing יִצְדִּיק in the land, Yahweh will have a particular concern for the cause of the poor and outcast, the widow and orphan (cf. Amos 2:6-7; 5:12-15; Mic.3:2 and Is.5:7): already in the thought of the 8th century prophets the "righteousness of Yahweh" implies an element of deliverance. But it is not only the weak and oppressed for whom the righteous judgment of Yahweh means deliverance. It means the same for any humble, trusting man who pleads his cause

events of history? Israel's history is proof of Y's. power and he wins the case and is declared "in the right". At Exod.9:27, after the early plagues, Pharaoh admits "אָנֹכִי חָטָא" ("I have sinned, I have mistaken the situation"), Y. is in the right (יִצְדִּיק) and I and my people are in the wrong (אֲנִי וְעַמִּי) i.e. Y. has won his case, since he was able both to demonstrate his power and to protect his own people.

1 In Ps.50:6;75:8 Elohim is called shophet: and in Ps.82 the 'elohim (divine beings subservient to Y.) seem to possess judicial functions, though they are in fact dispensing false justice. We may say, with certainty, that justice was commonly postulated as one of the characteristics of the gods of the Ancient East.

2 Cf. Gen.18:25; Ex.23:7; 1 Kings 8:32; Hos.14:8-9; Ps.7:7-11; Jer.11:20; Zeph.3:5 and Ezra 9:15.



against the wicked and who is pronounced "in the right". His opponent is condemned and punished, while he is declared righteous (הַצְדִּיק) and delivered. This is the character of Yahweh's צַדִּיקָה.

The conception underlying this use of the term is that a righteous God must distinguish in his dealings between the wicked man, who neither fears God nor deals justly with men, and the righteous man, who though he be not perfect but is indeed often confessedly a sinner, yet relatively speaking, lives uprightly and trusts in God. (Cf. Noah, Gen. 6:9) The righteousness of God in this aspect of it involving the deliverance of the upright is often spoken of in parallelism with salvation, but without losing sight of the basis of such salvation in the discriminating righteousness of God. 1

Thus, within the action of the divine righteousness there is a place for deliverance and for condemnation, a place for salvation and for punishment. This characterisation of the content of the צַדִּיקָה יְהוָה towards the nation had its origin, like all Israel's theological statements, in experience and in reflective interpretation of events. As we have seen, national victories in war were demonstrations of Yahweh's loyalty to the "right" relationship of the Covenant and were therefore termed צַדִּיקוֹת יְהוָה. Time after time did this faithfulness effect the nation's deliverance (1 Sam. 12:7, Mic. 6:5), but, at other times, that faithfulness might mean the very opposite, condemnation and the resulting captivity (cf. Is. 10:22). At Lam. 1:18, the city

I. E. D. Burton, Galatians, ICC, (Edinburgh, 1921) p. 462.



of Jerusalem, defeated, located and destroyed, is made to exclaim, not "The Lord is unjust", but "The Lord is in the right (  $\text{ק'רַץ}$  ): I have rebelled against his word". This point received fine expression long ago from G.A. Smith:

History, to Israel, was God's supreme tribunal... When the decision of history went against the nation, when they were threatened with expulsion from their land and with extinction as a people, that just meant that the Supreme Judge of men was giving His sentence against them. Israel had broken the terms of the covenant. They had lost their right; they were no longer righteous. 1

Most remarkable is the fact that this might well have been, indeed should have been, the state of affairs in the time of Deutero-Isaiah. But instead of the expected condemnation, the righteousness of God in his prophecy almost exclusively means deliverance and salvation. The great new factor here is that strict justice was not adhered to, so far as the action of Yahweh was concerned: and the prophet's theology was born in interpreting events. Israel was not "in the right": she had failed on her side of the covenant, and she knew it, yet she was being delivered (46:12-13): the people had no "right" whose vindication could be hoped for, yet historical happenings could only mean that Yahweh was giving sentence in their favour (54:17). In Isaiah's theology the explanation is found, not on the basis of a just claim having been won by Israel through her suffering,

1 G.A. Smith, The Book of Isaiah, Expositor's Bible, (London, 1888-90) Vol.2, p.218.



but in the character of Yahweh himself. The nation had paid the heavy penalty for her sin and rebellion (40:2); a new beginning is being offered to her by Yahweh because of his steadfast adherence in love and mercy to the purpose He had in his choice of Israel. And that purpose - to perfect a fellowship - which is exhibited in the figure and in the activity of the Servant, is concerned, not only with Israel, but with all nations.<sup>1</sup> In order that it may be advanced, Yahweh's righteousness (according to the prophet's interpretation) is such as will, through faithfulness and love, give sentence in favour of those whose right it is not.

Hearken to me, you stubborn of heart,  
Ye who are far from righteousness (  $\text{הַצְדִּיקָה}$  )  
I bring near my righteousness (  $\text{הַצְדִּיקָה}$  );  
It is not far off, and my salvation will  
not tarry. 46: 12-13. cf. 51:5-8.

A righteous (  $\text{צַדִּיק}$  ) God and a Saviour,  
There is none beside me. 45:21.

The word  $\text{הַצְדִּיקָה}$  has become, in Deutero-Isaiah's handling of it, fundamentally soteriological, close in meaning to "salvation". In the words of A.B. Davidson, "Salvation is, so to speak, the clothing, the manifestation of Jehovah's righteousness".<sup>2</sup> In His saving activity, Yahweh's righteousness is illustrated and embodied.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Eichrodt, op.cit., p.247, "The maintenance of the fellowship now becomes the justification of the ungodly". This theme is very clearly represented in the Qumran literature, cf. 1QS 11: 3ff. and 9ff. and 1QH.4:33-34.

<sup>2</sup> Theology of the Old Testament, (Edinburgh 1904) p.397.



This confidence in Yahweh's purpose was taught by Isaiah to the nation. In the book of Psalms it has become the possession of the individual believer who can reckon himself among those whom Yahweh will accept in that righteousness of His which comes close to mercy, Ps.35:24ff. 37:6, 31:1 and 71:2. The universalism of Isaiah, however, appears to have been generally replaced by a narrower and more distributive view of justice, often in terms of rewards and punishments in accordance with the standards of the law.

Before leaving this discussion of the "righteousness" of Yahweh, two further points may be briefly noticed. The first is the association of "righteousness" with the Messiah. This is not surprising in view of the application of the term to the king, whose activity will be taken up by the Messiah on a wider and more perfect plane. The words  $\text{קִדְּשׁ}$  and  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹ}$  (and also  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹ}$ ) form part of the typical style of all Messianic oracles (Is. 9 and 11, Zech. 9) and of the Servant songs (Is.42 and 53:11). Moreover, Jeremiah creates for the Messiah the name Yahweh Tsidgenu, which is not only in opposition to the name of the reigning monarch, Zedekiah, but also summarises, for the prophet, the whole work of the Messiah, Jer.23:5-6.

The second point is of a more general nature. Throughout our discussion of the "righteousness" of Yahweh,



we have assumed that it reflects the ideas associated with the "righteousness" of the king. In their origin, this is probably true, but we must also reckon with the possibility, indeed the probability, that the ideas of kingly and all human righteousness were, in turn, coloured by their having been associated with the Divine. In short, the development of the meaning and content of the sdq words is not just in one direction, from the human level to the divine: it comes back from its association with the divine to be used on the human level with added significance.<sup>1</sup> For example, the character of kingly "righteousness" is reflected (so we have claimed) in the OT description of Yahweh's righteousness and justice: but in Psalm 72, a great Psalm of kingship, we have this plea made to Yahweh, "Give the king thy justice, and thy righteousness ( תִּצְדִּיק וְתִשְׁפָּט ) to the royal son". The character of kingly righteousness must now be a reflection of the righteousness of Yahweh. The king will defend the poor and needy (v.4) because this is the true nature of Yahweh's judgments. In more general terms, this means that the character of human righteousness in obedience to Yahweh must be in accordance with the revealed character of Yahweh himself.<sup>2</sup> With this we come to the second main strand of our discussion.

<sup>1</sup> This kind of 3-fold development may be quite common. D. Daube has revealed it in the case of go'el, Studies in Biblical Law, pp.39-62, especially p.53.

<sup>2</sup> The righteousness which Y. has demonstrated is a righteousness bent on salvation: it is this kind of right-



2. The application of sdq to Israel and to the individual. Some points relating to this theme have already become clear. 1. The character of human judicial righteousness in the judge and particularly in the king tends towards "assistance" and "deliverance". 2. The root is used to denote the "righteousness" of the plaintiff, where it bears the meaning "in the right" or "having a just cause": the standard or norm is supplied within the situation or from the law with reference to which the claim is made. 3. By virtue of her position as the covenant people, Israel assumed the righteousness of her cause before Yahweh and therefore counted on his intervention on her behalf when danger threatened that position. Yahweh must honour the "right" relationship which he had inaugurated and, in order that it might remain as it should be, must grant his people victory in battle, Jud. 5:11.

So long as danger to the claims of Israel within the covenant relationship was reckoned only in terms of a threat from outside enemies, so long could the "righteousness" of Yahweh be regarded in terms of victory and success. With the coming of the prophetic age, however, Israel was made aware not only of the possibility of the eousness and not strict justice (in the sense of equality of rights before an impartial law) which must be reflected in the judgments of Yahweh's people. We might even claim that the common OT ethical pattern or formula operates in this connection also: "As Yahweh is righteous. . . so be ye righteous...."



rights of the covenant people being endangered from within (by social and political schism breaking up the national unity) but also of the question of the legitimacy of her pretensions. Was Israel "in the right" simply because she could regard herself as the chosen people? The way was now open for a new approach to the matter of Yahweh's righteousness with reference to the inward life of his people. The terminology of sdq was consequently taken up to characterise both the conditions for, and the effects and purpose of, Yahweh's action in maintaining the covenant. If Yahweh was to be faithful to this relationship and declare Israel "in the right" (with all that that meant to her in terms of success and well-being), then Israel must be "in the right", she must have a "righteous" cause, she must possess "righteousness" (Hos.10;12, Is. 28:16f), and the quality and character of that "righteousness" would be determined by the character of Yahweh's "righteousness" within the covenant. Here again we can see the effect upon the content of the term of its association with the Divine.

With regard to the prophetic emphasis on the necessity of righteousness within Israel, it is often urged by historians of Israel's religion that this is the ethicising of her faith. While this is not untrue, it is of interest only as we understand the reasons for it and the character of it. The term sdq, when applied to Israel,



retained the idea of being "in the right" or possessing that status, but the norm or standard by which the "rightness" was judged was the covenant relation and its demands: in other words, the content of the term was supplied from the situation and the standard. Now when corruption and oppression flourished, (as in the time of the 8th century prophets), the right-ordering of the community was impossible and the purpose of the covenant was threatened and contradicted: therefore that which would put Israel "in the right" before Yahweh was quite clearly ethical and moral reform of such a kind as would embody the principles of right community-order (justice, equality, sincerity etc.) and so contribute to the maintenance of the covenant. Thus it would be of more value to emphasise (i) the fact that the circumstances in which the prophets spoke provided, indeed demanded, specific ethical content for a familiar judicial term, and (ii) that that content was directly concerned with social balance as a covenant requirement reflecting Yahweh's righteousness, than to suggest that the prophets ethicised Israel's (non-ethical?) religion. In short, we may regard the prophetic teaching as essentially a recalling of Israel to the covenant and to the standards and way of life which should characterise national and individual existence under the covenant.



The specific content of edq again depends on the situation with reference to which it is applied when it is used in the Psalms to denote a class, in opposition to "evil-doers" (פְּעֻלֵי אָוֶן) or "the wicked" (רְשָׁעִים). These latter have been variously identified as apostate Jews, foreign enemies, sorcerers and false accusers, but it seems unwise to look for a single explanation according to one formula.<sup>1</sup> Their identity probably varies within the Psalms and with it the identity of the "righteous", whose character is to be gauged by contrast. On many occasions, however, the "righteous" are those who, in humility and faithfulness, trust in Yahweh, despite persecution and oppression, those who seek to live uprightly and without pride of heart (יָיִן, יִי), depending on Yahweh for protection. His "righteousness" is their only refuge and source of pardon. Their "righteousness" is not ethical perfection, but that simple God-fearing obedience of the faithful who plead with Yahweh for a favourable decision, not always in order to be "justified" against an adversary, but often, in an absolute manner, to be accepted and saved. The Torah-liturgy of approach sums it up;

Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?  
And who shall stand in his holy place?  
He who has clean hands and a pure heart,  
Who does not lift up his soul to what is false,

<sup>1</sup> See A.R. Johnson, "The Psalms", in The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.M. Rowley, (Oxford, 1951) pp. 197ff.



And does not swear deceitfully.  
He will receive blessing from the Lord,  
And vindication (צדקה) from the God  
of his salvation. Ps. 24:3-5.

In conclusion, we turn again to Deutero-Isaiah, and to the final chapters of the book. In Deutero-Isaiah we discovered that the "righteousness" of Yahweh was developing towards a justification of the ungodly, a salvation which is unmerited. Consequently, there could be no affirmation of Israel's righteousness before Yahweh. She possessed no "just" case: she had no "righteous" claim on Yahweh's mercy: justice in her legal transactions was absent: she was indeed far from righteousness,<sup>1</sup> (46:12 and cf. 48:1b, 18). Yet in merciful faithfulness to his covenant purpose Yahweh has "declared her to be in the right". Her only righteousness before the nations is the knowledge and experience of this salvation.<sup>2</sup> The unmerited vindication, the new beginning in grace, brings with it, however, the demand that righteousness in keeping with the covenant should be the character of Israel's subsequent life. That

---

<sup>1</sup> The Suffering Servant, the ideal Israel, is "righteous" and will make many to be accounted righteous, i.e. procure a right relation to Y. for many, 53:11. "Righteousness" attends Cyrus (42:1) in the sense of "success or victory", since he was the instrument to demonstrate to the world Yahweh's righteous purpose regarding Israel.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Achtemeier, *op.cit.*, p.85: "Yahweh will fulfil the demands of the covenant relationship. He will maintain his righteousness. He will do so by justifying Israel, by imputing righteousness to her who has no righteousness, by delivering her who has no right to be delivered (46:12-13). And this will be Israel's righteousness before all the world, that God helps her (50:9 of 52:13 - 53:12)..."



requirement finds expression in chapters 56-59 of the book, beginning with the exhortation: "Keep justice and do righteousness (  $\text{ןִיִּצְדִּיק}$  )". Now, that righteousness means (as in the earlier prophets) social justice, sincere worship and upright conduct (56:9 - 58:9): it means, in short, the conditions for the right-ordering of the nation's life within the covenant. When these qualities are present, there will be national recovery and covenant harmony.

Your righteousness shall go before you,  
And the glory of the Lord shall be your rearward:  
Then you shall call and the Lord will answer,  
You shall cry, and He will say "Here I am". (58:8-9).

Finally, in the thrilling vision of restoration presented by the closing chapters of the book, this will have been achieved. "Righteousness" will be the government of the community (60:17): the people shall be righteous and flourish (60:21): their righteousness will be known to all nations (62:2): and all this will be to the glory of Yahweh who chose them; who, in faithfulness and mercy, "justified" them when they were not "righteous"; and to whom, now, they have responded with devotion and sincerity.

By way of summary on the "righteousness" of Israel, we draw attention to a passage in Deut. 6:20ff, from a book which writes history in terms of the covenant. The question is asked, "What is the meaning of the testimonies

Despite her failure to do the right, despite her lack of faith, Yahweh. . . will decide in her favour. Deutero-Isaiah's plea is that Israel but faithfully accept such deliverance."



and statutes and ordinances which the Lord commanded?" In the answer, their meaning is related to the Exodus, the event of election. "We were slaves in Egypt. . and we were brought out. . . and the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as at this day". In short, the law is meaningless outside the relationship, outside the covenant. "And", the passage goes on, "it will be קִרְבָּנֵךְ for us, if we are careful to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he has commanded us" (cf. Deut. 24:13). In other words, the vitality of the community and its right internal ordering, its right attitude to Yahweh, and the personal righteousness of its members - these all lie in acceptance of Yahweh's election and in obedience to the law, which is divine guidance within the covenant relationship.

Observations on the Semantics of the sdq-words.

At the beginning of this study, we asserted as a basic semantic principle that usage must be the ultimately decisive guide to meaning. In the course of the work - which may be regarded as an exercise in historical semantics - a number of other significant points for the interpretation of Biblical terms have become clear.

1. First, the obvious, but nonetheless important, fact that the sdq-words do not appear in Biblical Hebrew as new words.



The root had a previous history and the words derived from it had developed meanings. Our review of Ancient Near Eastern usage revealed the association with deity, the forensic or judicial sense ("in the right") and the qualitative or descriptive use ("righteous king"). As for the original significance of the root, we can only suggest that it lay somewhere in the notion of conformity to a norm, a norm which required to be defined in each particular case. The use of root sdq in the OT clearly takes up and builds upon these earlier associations and meanings.

2. Although the Biblical Hebrew use of sdq was founded on the earlier usage which it inherited, yet the word was given a characteristic content by the particular ideas with which it became associated in the Biblical literature. Chief among these is the application to the Covenant relation and to the character and action of Yahweh revealed in that Covenant. The dominance of the covenant-idea in the development of the meaning of sdq-words has been obvious at every stage. Yahweh's "righteousness", as covenant faithfulness, meant "victory" for Israel over her enemies: Israel's "righteousness" meant faithfulness to the covenant relation and, in particular, obedience to those obligations and laws of the covenant which provided principles for the right-ordering of the nation's life, in its manward and Godward aspects: the character of community



and personal "righteousness" depended on the circumstances out of which the demand arose, but it was always regarded as having its ultimate sanction in the obligations of the Covenant: and, finally, it was because of the constancy of Yahweh to the covenant (in the experience of Israel) that Deutero-Isaiah found it possible to express by the use of sdq something almost synonymous with "salvation". It would be true to say that it was its incorporation into the terminology of the covenant that secured the special religious character of  $\text{הַקְדָּשׁ}$  in the OT. In more linguistic terms, it is the "emotive force"<sup>1</sup> or the "predominant thought-trends"<sup>2</sup> of the covenant idea which provided the dynamic for the semantic expansion and development of the word.

3. The suggested three-fold development in the history of the sdq-words may be of guidance in the understanding and interpretation of other religious and theological terms. This development takes the word from an association with man and his life to association with God, and back again to man, with a richer content and colour drawn from its relation to deity. We have noticed this with reference to the character of the discriminating "righteousness" of the king. The "righteousness" of Yahweh first reflects the

1 The term belongs to H. Sperber, Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre, (2nd ed. Leipzig, 1930).

2 The term is from J. Schwietering, quoted in S. Ullmann, Principles of Semantics, (2nd ed. Oxford, 1957) pp.197-98.



Ancient Near Eastern ideal of kingly righteousness in its concern for the oppressed: then the word "righteousness" comes back to its association with the king in the form of a standard or demand to be fulfilled. In other words, Yahweh's  $\text{קדש}$  reflects the character of human  $\text{קדש}$ , but also provides the norm for that human  $\text{קדש}$ . This type of development may be discoverable in other terms in the OT.

4. We must comment on the semantic change in sdq-words within the OT. The idea of conformity to a norm seems to be the basic significance of sdq which most satisfactorily accounts for its various developments. To say this, however, does not mean that that sense was always recognisable or even present in the words at every stage of development. The primary meaning may be the key to understanding the direction of the semantic development, but usage, which brought the word into association with particular ideas and situations, must be the guide to meaning at any point. Now the OT usage of  $\text{קדש}$  does suggest that the word could, particularly with reference to Yahweh, take on the meaning of "that in which Yahweh's righteousness resulted", namely "deliverance", "salvation" and "victory". When the word developed one of these meanings, it did not necessarily lose the other meanings which it already possessed. The literature of the OT attests the retention of old meanings while new ones were developed. Linguistic study has recognised this type of phenomenon, and S. Ullmann puts it



thus, ". . a word may retain its previous sense or senses and at the same time acquire one or several new senses."<sup>1</sup> W.Wundt was also aware of this and so distinguished between "partial and total changes of meaning",<sup>2</sup> the latter being the cases in which a new meaning entirely supersedes the old, which therefore completely falls out of use. We may claim that  $\eta\pi\gamma\chi$  underwent the partial semantic change in the OT. In the case of the  $\chi$  of Yahweh, it changed from being descriptive of judicial activity to what the "righteousness" effected or was expected to effect: and in ethical contexts, it could change from meaning "the status of being in the right" to connote the character of actions and life necessary to achieve that status within the covenant relation, the idea of the covenant being the dynamic which caused the change. Nevertheless the earlier meanings of the term did not fall out of use as soon as the developments took place. One may note words of the philosopher and linguist W.M. Urban:

The fact that a sign (i.e. a linguistic sign or word) can intend one thing without ceasing to intend another, that, indeed, the very condition of its being an expressive sign for the second is that it is also a sign for the first, is precisely what makes language an instrument of knowing.

3

1 Ullmann, op.cit., p.174: see also p.117.

2. Völkerpsychologie. I, Die Sprache, (Leipzig, 1900) and see Ullmann, op.cit., p.175.

3 Language and Reality, (London, 1939) pp. 112ff.



In connection with a formal term like צדקה, it is very important to remember that the sense or meaning of terms is frequently fluid or vague: it is not delimited by any clear-cut lines, except in the case of scientific concepts: it is essentially open, asking for supplementation. "Un concept est toujours ouvert; il 'attend' de nouvelles déterminations de sens".<sup>1</sup>

5. In discussing צדקה as a descriptive or ethical term, we have seen that the particular circumstances in which the word is applied provide its content. This was the case with the prophetic demand for "righteousness" in Israel and with the class of "righteous" in the Psalms, whose identity has to be gauged from their opposite, the "wicked". Thus a different situation, even a different social milieu, will affect the content and character of צדקה when the term describes conduct.. The relativity of ethical rules in the OT should be recognised.

6. The suggestion that the specific content of basically formal terms requires to be supplied from the context of life in which they are used may be helpful for the interpretation of words such as משפט and תמים, which belong both to the judicial terminology of Israel and also to the language of the Covenant.

<sup>1</sup> H. Delacroix, Le Langage et la Pensée, (Paris, 1924), p. 204.



## II. Δίκαιος and related words in Greek Usage.

Because of its recognised connection with δείκνυμι<sup>1</sup> ("show" or "indicate") it seems probable that the original connotation of the word δίκη was "way indicated" or "that which is customary". When we first meet it in Greek literature, the word refers to a mythical divine being, "the virgin Δίκη, daughter of Zeus, who is honoured among the gods" (Hesiod, Works and Days, 256). This suggests that at an early stage of Greek thought the "established custom" was regarded as the divinely appointed or divinely recognised way of things. This is confirmed by Hesiod's remark that "Unhappy is that city which the divine virgin has fled..", because its affairs will be in chaos, and also by Soph. Ant. 450-57 which points out that, in the case of a dispute between human and divine right, δίκη will be on the side of the eternal laws of Zeus and against human νόμοι. It was Solon who "demythologised" the concept: for him δίκη ("justice") is no longer a divine being, yet is more than a human device: it is a law, the law of the universe, which is independent of man and cannot be evaded by him. Consequently, we may say that δίκη was the norm (invested with divine sanction) for human conduct, chiefly for the conduct of men towards one another, and, as such, was logically

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Boisacq, Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque, (Heidelberg, 1950) and J.B. Hofmann, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen, (München, 1949).



regarded as "right": that which is customary and conforms to the divinely recognised order is "the right": With its implicit juristic reference, the word came to mean also "judgment" (Homer, Hesiod, etc.) After Homer, the forensic reference became increasingly prominent and the word was frequently used of "proceedings instituted to determine legal rights",<sup>1</sup> a "lawsuit" or "trial", and even of the objects or consequences of legal action, i.e. "satisfaction" or "penalty". With this sense, δίκη is used three times in the New Testament, Acts 28:4, 2 Thess.1:9 and Jude 7.

A person whose conduct conforms to the standard δίκη, is δίκαιος : he does what is right, according to the traditions of society (Hom.Ody.6.119f.; 9.174-6): he renders to others their rights and exacts his own. The word may be thus employed with the broad sense "right" (Hom.Ody.18.413, Thuc.3.40, Plat.Gorg.507b, Arist.NE.5.1129a); or in a more specific sense, "just" (Hes.Op.270ff, Herondas 2:86-γνώμη δικάϊα κρίσιν δικάϊτατε), i.e. rendering to each what he has the right to claim according to social rule.

τὸ δίκαιον (which is more frequently used than δικαιοσύνη) is defined by Aristotle as "that which is legal and fair" (τὸ μὲν δίκαιον ἄρα τὸ νόμιμον καὶ τὸ ἴσον NE.1129a,1.34.), clearly distinguishing the two parts of justice, viz. legality and equality. It is also defined as "that which is

<sup>1</sup> In Herodotus, δίκη stands for the "decision of a judge", conforming to a norm.



due from one man to another" (Thuc.3.54; Dem.572.14) and this either as one's duty or rights or penal deserts. Although in the older Greek literature (e.g. Hom.Ody.6.120 and 13.209f, Hymn to Demeter, 386-9) to be δίκαιος included the discharge of obligations to the gods as well as to men, and τὸ δίκαιον was regarded as having the sanction of divine authority, yet, in the later classical writers, when νόμος had become the source and basis of equality and had taken over the religious significance of δίκη, the predominant reference in δίκαιος was to the mutual relations of men.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in moral philosophy, the term indicates the possession of social and political virtue. Though δίκαιος is frequently used in a non-moral sense, there is usually a reference to a standard (either in the nature of the thing itself or outside it) or a demand requiring to be satisfied, as when the word means "exact" (as applied to numbers), "fitting", "suitable", "correct" or "genuine" (Hdt.2.149, Xen.Mem.IV.4.5 and Aesch. Agam.1604).

The noun δικαιοσύνη belongs to the third stage in word-formation, following δίκη and δίκαιος : it is found first at Herod.1.96. Being the character of the δίκαιος (who is now the man who conforms to νόμος), the

<sup>1</sup> That justice could not be understood without reference to religion is an idea still clear in Plato when he relates δίκαιος and ὅσιος (Gorg.507b, Rep.1, 331a). In Euthy.12c-e, ὅσιον is defined as part of δίκαιον.



term early bears the sense of the "prescribed behaviour of the citizen towards society"; in other words, it is a social virtue.<sup>1</sup> With his usual disregard of precise formulation, Plato represents δικαιοσύνη as the state of any agent (whether person or association) in which each of the component elements does its own work or performs its proper function. In the city, this means the harmony of the various classes: in the individual, it consists in a certain relation between the different tendencies (the passionate, the rational and the appetitive). For Plato it is not so definite a thing as the virtues of σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία and φρόνησις, but rather that which makes possible the realisation of these: ὁ πᾶσιν ἐκείνοις τὴν δύναμιν παρέσχευ ὥστε ἐγγένεσθαι, καὶ ἐγγενομένοις γε σωτηρίαν παρέχειν, ἕως-περ ἂν ἐνῇ Rep.iv, 433b. Aristotle devotes a whole book of his treatise on Ethics to δικαιοσύνη, and describes two kinds: (i) δικαιοσύνη as a particular virtue, the opposite of πλεονεξία, and meaning the "assigning to a man his due": this may be sub-divided into two aspects, a distributive (διανεμητική) and a corrective (διορθωτική), NE.5: 1130bff (ii) δικαιοσύνη as co-extensive with the whole of virtue (sic Plato), not as a particular virtue. It is in fact the highest expression of virtue, ἡ τελεία ἀρετή, the realised ἔξις of ἀρετή in man, dealing with his fellow-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the fragment of Theognis quoted by Aristotle, ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετή ἐστι, Diehl. 124.



men. As the performance of all one's social duties, it is essentially πρὸς ἕτερον (NE. 5.1129b and 1130b). For Aristotle, δικαιοσύνη is less idealistic than it is for Plato: it is realised in concrete relations and these may subsist in any society. The judicial notion belonging to δικαιοσύνη as a particular virtue continues in the definition given by Aristotle in Rhet.1.1366b: ἐστὶ δὲ δικαιοσύνη μὲν ἀρετὴ δι' ἣν τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι ἔχουσι, καὶ ὡς ὁ νόμος. Here the underlying idea is that of a judge awarding to each his due, and, in fact, δικαιοσύνη occasionally refers to "justice" as the business of the judge, Plat.Gorg.464b-c. In a few instances the word can mean "correctness", but these are mostly translations of the Hebrew פִּזָּח (e.g. "sacrifices of פִּזָּח") and are found in the Septuagint.

The verb δικαίω comes from the adj. δίκαιος and being causative in form should (by analogy) mean "to make δίκαιος or δίκαιον". In classical Greek, however, it never has exactly this force. In a famous fragment of Pindar (169, 3), quoted by Plato (Gorg.484b), it has the sense of "to set right" or possibly "to recognise as right" ( νόμος . . . δικαίων τὸ βικαιότατον ): but this meaning is unusual. Its ordinary uses fall under two main heads: (1) with an impersonal object, it denotes "to hold or deem a thing to be right or suitable",<sup>1</sup> even "to decide" or "claim as a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ἀξιόω : verbs in -ω, derived from adjs. expressing a value judgment, commonly mean "to deem or account....".



right" that a thing should be done. This use is very common in Classical writers and in Philo and Josephus.

(ii) Applied to persons, δικάσιώ is widely used to mean "to do one right or justice", "to treat justly" (i.e. as the opposite of ἀδικεῖν ), and this chiefly in malam partem for "to pass sentence on", "to condemn and punish". In the passive, the verb is used in the sense of "to have right or justice done to one" (cf. Arist.NE 5.1136a). The use of the word in the Hermetic tractate "On Regeneration" (C.Her,13:9) calls for special attention: χωρὶς γὰρ κρίσεως ἴδε πῶς τὴν ἀδικίαν ἐξήλασεν... ἐδικαιώθημεν, ὡ τέκνον ἀδικίας ἀπούσης . The writer is describing the way in which the divine nature is implanted in man, who is thus "reborn" or "deified". At each stage of the process, one of the vices natural to humanity is replaced by a god-given virtue (e.g. ignorance is replaced by knowledge). Among these changes is the substitution of δικαιοσύνη for ἀδικία , but instead of expressing the former by the relevant abstract noun, the writer uses the verb: consequently the meaning is quite simply, "We have been made righteous, now that unrighteousness is away". If the phrase connotes ethical change, the author may here betray acquaintance with Pauline language as interpreted by Greek commentators.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks p.59. It is possible that this Tractate of the Hermetica was influenced by Christian thinking and expressions.



The noun *δικαίωμα* means an "act of right" or "amendment of wrong", and also a "plea or claim of right". It is used frequently in the papyri of "legal deeds or evidence", and appears in Philo, Josephus and the LXX with the meaning "legal statute", "ordinance" or "demand".

*Δικαιῶσις* is employed with the general sense of putting into action that which is *δίκαιον* (right): it is judicial "setting right" or "doing justice" to someone, especially of condemnation or punishment. It may also be used of a "plea or demand of right", i.e. a "just claim", and even of "a judging what is right".

At this stage of our study we may observe some points of similarity and of contrast between the Greek *δίκαιος* etc. and the Hebrew sdq-words.

1. The idea of conformity to a norm and a general forensic reference are common to the meaning and development of the concept "righteousness" in both languages.
2. The relation of "custom" to "right" in early Greek thought is parallel to the early sense of *רצח* "in the right", a status which was frequently established with reference to convention or social law. The Greek idea, however, may have had overtones not possessed by the Hebrew.
3. In both Greek and Hebrew usage the word for "righteousness" belongs to the terminology of relationships in community. In Greek, *δικαιοσύνη* is generally associated



with the mutual obligations of men in human society, without reference (except in early writers) to divine sanction: in the Hebrew tradition, on the other hand, the behaviour of man within community is governed by the consciousness of the covenant relation, and therefore has reference ultimately to the demands of God and conformity to the divine will. This relation of  $\pi\lambda\alpha$  to God and his law, rather than to social customs or abstract principles, emphasises the inwardness of "righteousness" in the thought of the Hebrew people.

4. There is nothing in Greek thought lastingly comparable to the idea of the "righteousness of God", and consequently no development of the meaning of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  towards "victory" or "salvation". This significance was added to the Greek word when the LXX translators used it to render צדקות יהוה .

5. The particular actions which provide the content for  $\pi\lambda\alpha$  are often those which the Greek mind would recognise as  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha$  , in the sense of social virtue. Corruption, false dealing and oppression (as condemned by the prophets) would be described in Greek as  $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$  . But the criterion by which they are adjudged as such in Hebrew thought is primarily the divine demand within the covenant relation, rather than, as in Greek thought, what was socially just or fair.

6. Throughout most of its development the Greek  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$



tended towards the more precise and narrow sense of "justice", the giving of what was due to each. Aristotle's division of δικαιοσύνη (as one among the virtues) into two aspects, διανεμητική and διωρθωτική, is simply a systematisation of current thought on the matter. The Stoic definition is on the same lines - ἐπιστήμη διανεμητική τῆς ἀξίας ἐκάστῳ (Stobaeus, Ec1.2.102). Consequently there is nothing parallel to the development in Hebrew from the idea of strict justice towards "deliverance" and "assistance" as the characteristic of the judge and of God as supreme judge of men.

7. Plato's profound treatment of δικαιοσύνη as "a state of being" seems to have had little effect on current usage of the term and little influence on the immediately succeeding philosophical thought. Aristotle means something different when he writes of δικαιοσύνη as perfect virtue, containing all other virtues, and displayed in society. But even this idea of δικαιοσύνη differs from the Hebrew נקדח. The latter is distinguished radically from Plato's theoretical and intellectual "justice" by being a concrete, experienced thing: נקדח happens and can be recognised in the affairs of men. And from Aristotle it differs in that its content is determined by something more than social duty: נקדח is determined by the demands of God made known within the covenant relation.



Appended note on G. Schrenk's study of δίκαιοσύνη

Two points made by G. Schrenk in the course of his study of δίκαιοσύνη and related words are worthy of some comment. The first is found on p.14 of the English translation of the TWNT article:<sup>1</sup>

. . . Plato himself, though expressly treating of justice as a political virtue, finds the root of the matter in the human soul, where the individual is truly himself, with all his powers in order and harmony (Rep.4.433c ff.) Δίκαιος thus comes to signify an innate quality of human nature, of which man avails himself in his activities. Josephus not only regards it as belonging to the sphere of virtue, but goes the length of speaking of his heroes as men who are "naturally" (τῇ φύσει) righteous, e.g. Ant.7: 110; 9.216. (Italics mine).

This interpretation of Plato seems strange. Schrenk is referring to the famous passage on the "three parts" of the soul. Now, in the first place, for Plato the soul is not the location of "the root" of δίκαιοσύνη, but affords an illustration of the scheme he has already propounded for justice in the state. Having found what makes a city display justice, he could apply the result to the individual, provided he had a similar structure to that of the city with its three classes: and with the help of Pythagorean teaching Plato claims just that.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, Plato does not say that the ordering principle or harmonising power, δίκαιο-  
1 Righteousness, Bible Key words, (London, 1951).

2 Cf. N.R. Murphy, An Interpretation of Plato's Republic, (Oxford, 1951) p.14.



δύνη , is "in the soul": he declares that the three springs of action (reason, spiritedness and appetite) are "in the soul", while δικαιοδύνη connotes personal control of them through respect for the principles of rationality (5.441d-e, 443d). Thirdly, δικαιοδύνη in Plato is not really a quality (innate or otherwise) but a state or method of living. As for the two Josephus references given by Schrenk to support his contention, it is quite clear from the contexts that δίκαιος τὴν φύσιν means "just-natured" or "just, by disposition and character" (cf. Eng. "good-natured") and not "innately just or righteous". The second point is found on p.27 and refers back to what was quoted above from p.14.

The fundamental idea among the Greeks is that δικαιοδύνη , like all other virtues, is natural to man. Cf. Arist.NE.VI, xiii, 1144b, 27.

The passage in Aristotle speaks of "certain moral qualities (ἡθῆ) as being 'natural' (φύσει): καὶ γὰρ δίκαιοι καὶ σωφρονικοὶ καὶ ἀνδρειοὶ καὶ τὰλλα ἔχομεν εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς (from the moment of birth)", but it goes on, "true moral excellence (ἀρετή) cannot be produced without practical wisdom", which, for Aristotle, is the ordering principle. Concerning Schrenk's statement two things must be said: (1) Assuming that Aristotle means by "innate δικαιοδύνη " (but note that he does not use the noun, but the adj.) what Schrenk seems to think he means, that idea is not



characteristic of Plato, as shown above. It is erroneous to claim that the idea is "fundamental among the Greeks". It is unwise to class together too readily the varieties of thought expressed within the Greek tradition.

(11) Since Schrenk quotes Aristotle, we must enquire what is meant by the statement and place it within the context of Aristotle's thought. An earlier and fuller discussion of "innate virtue" is found in NE 2.1103a ff. There it is clearly stated (against the aristocratic view that virtue is a gift of nature) that moral virtues (ἡθικὴν) comes as the result of habit (ἔθος) and do not arise in us by nature, since nothing that exists by nature can form a habit contrary to nature, and habit may engender vice as well as virtue. They do not come by nature (A. says) nor are they contrary to nature: we are adapted by nature to receive them. Aristotle is here claiming that we have a natural capacity for, or disposition towards, the virtues, which are only possessed by the exercise of them. In short man becomes just by doing just acts. When we come to Bk.5 Aristotle studies this natural capacity under the name "natural virtue".<sup>1</sup> Thus, in the passage quoted by Schrenk, Aristotle is not speaking of innate δικαιοσύνη at all, but of innate capacity to be δίκαιος (and he does use the adj.).

<sup>1</sup> This is confirmed in one of the most recent commentaries on the Ethics of Aristotle, L'Éthique à Nicomaque par R.A. Gauthier et J.Y. Jolif, (Louvain, 1959) Tome 2, p.108, note 2.



It is one thing to say "I am born possessing 'righteousness'", but quite another to say "I am born able to become, or even disposed to become, righteous."

The reason for this lengthy and critical note is as follows: by these statements, particularly the second, Schrenk implies a contrast between what he calls (erroneously) the "fundamental Greek idea" that δικαιοσύνη is innate in man, and Paul (standing within the Hebrew tradition) for whom δικαιοσύνη is bestowed on man; cf. p.46 of the article. That is an entirely unjustifiable contrast. The meaning of δικαιοσύνη and δίκαιος when regarded as innate (as by Aristotle, in the sense of innate capacity) is quite different from what Paul means by δικαιοσύνη as a gift. There is no place in the Pauline corpus where δίκαιος or a cognate word could be translated or interpreted in terms of the philosophical idea of "disposition towards δικαιοσύνη"; nor is it likely that in Aristotle δικαιοσύνη could be interpreted in terms of the Pauline theological "righteousness". What may be explored and contrasted is the different semantic value of the word in the two usages, not statements about δικαιοσύνη (abstracted from context) taken as if the word had only one meaning for both Paul and Aristotle.



### III. The Septuagint

In the LXX the terms δίκαιος , δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοῦν appear as the regular translations of פ'דש , פ'דש , ׀פ'דש and פ'דש : out of a possible 476 occurrences of the root 462 are represented by the δίκαιος words.<sup>1</sup> Such consistency on the part of the translators argues that, in their usage, the amount of semantic overlap between the two groups of words was regarded as very great: δίκαιος etc. would appear to have been the most satisfactory words available to render the meaning of the Hebrew פ'דש for the Greek-speaking readers of the OT. Nevertheless, the Hebrew root was occasionally translated differently and sometimes δίκαιος etc. represent other Hebrew words.

We begin with a brief mention of the most significant cases in which the δίκαιος words do not translate פ'דש. The Niph'al of the verb ( פ'דשׁ ) is used with the "temple" as subject in Dan.8:14. This we found necessary to translate as "the temple will be put right, or restored to what it should be". Instead of rendering the Hebrew verb by δικαιο-  
 θήσεται (as it would normally be) the LXX and Theodotion have καθαρισθήσεται . This supports our interpretation of the Hebrew; but the translator, realising that that sense could not be elicited from δικαιοθήσεται departs from the usual rendering of פ'דש and interprets according to the  
 1 The word δίκη never translates any part of the root פ'דש.



sense required in context. Rather than to suppose that the translator did not understand the Hebrew usage and gave an alternative, it seems safer to assume that he was aware that the right sense could not be extracted from the normal Greek rendering. At Job 4:17, the Qal of  $\pi\tau\chi$  is represented by  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{o}s\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$  <sup>1</sup>, and at 22:3 by  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\mu\pi\tau\omicron>s\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ . In most of the cases where  $\pi\tau\chi$  is not rendered by  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron>\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  the words  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\omicron>s$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron>\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  appear. Now it will be recalled that in our OT discussion we noticed that the  $\pi\tau\chi$  of the judge and of Yahweh tended away from the mere giving of justice towards the idea of "assistance", "protection" and "help" offered to the weak and oppressed.<sup>2</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that this notion was introduced from time to time by the LXX translators, especially since the usual rendering of  $\pi\tau\chi$  by  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron>\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  would not convey the idea of "merciful action", because, as we have pointed out, the Greek term retained the flavour of "strict justice" throughout its entire usage. Both human  $\pi\tau\chi$  and Divine  $\pi\tau\chi$  are represented by  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\omicron>s, \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron>\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  : the former

1 N.H. Snaith, Distinctive Ideas of the OT (London, 1944) p. 166 includes in this category Gen.24:8 and Is.65:5, but while  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{o}s$  appears in the LXX, the verbs are not  $\pi\tau\chi$ : in Gen. it is  $\pi\kappa$  and in Is.  $\psi\kappa$ .

2 Cf. J. Skinner, HDB, (5th ed. Edinburgh, 1906) vol.4 p.274 on Righteousness: "The idea.... includes a large-hearted construction of the claims of humanity; it is, as has been said, the humanitarian virtue par excellence." In post-Biblical Hebrew and in the Targums and Talmud  $\pi\tau\chi$  most frequently means "an act of benevolence" going beyond legal obligations (contrasted with  $\gamma\prime$  "strict justice") and "almsgiving".



at Dan.4:24(27), Ezek. 18:19,21; and the latter at Ps.23:5, 32:5 and 102:6. It must be admitted, however, that the translation ἐλεημοσύνη has altered the meaning of the Hebrew on two occasions, Deut.6:25 and 24:13. Both passages state that obedience to the laws of Yahweh will be  $\eta\pi\tau\chi$  for the people or for the individual. It seems probable that the Hebrew means that obedience is the way to righteousness and the right-ordering of the community,<sup>1</sup> but the rendering ἐλεημοσύνη must refer to the "merciful action" of Yahweh which Israel will experience if they are obedient to Yahweh's commands. Although the LXX thus translates  $\eta\pi\tau\chi$  by ἔλεος and ἐλεημοσύνη, it deserves notice that σωτηρία never appears for the Hebrew word, though this is clearly the area of meaning to which the root  $\pi\tau\chi$  frequently approaches in Deutero-Isaiah and Psalms.

More important for our purpose is the use of δίκαιος etc. to render Hebrew words other than those from root  $\pi\tau\chi$ . We may note the following cases. Δίκαιος is found for  $\pi\tau\chi$  (  $\pi\tau\chi$  ), "straightforward", "upright" ("uprightness") in Job 1:1; in Prov.3:32, 11:3, 14:9, 21:2,18, and Δικαιοσύνη once for  $\pi\tau\chi$  ( = "uprightness" ) at 1 Chron.29:17. The fact that this translation is almost confined to Job and Proverbs is interesting. Both translators (if in fact there was not only one) of these books are sensitive to Greek

<sup>1</sup> S.<sup>n</sup>. Driver, Deuteronomy, ICC (Edinburgh,1896) p.96 implies that both verses bear this sense.



style and usage and their work bears traces of familiarity with Hellenistic Alexandrian culture;<sup>1</sup> in fact they show the early stages of that Hellenisation of the OT which reached its peak with Philo.<sup>2</sup> In view of this, it seems likely that their use of δίκαιος for נָשִׁי׃ betrays the Greek idea of δίκαιος as the description of the "virtuous" man.

Δίκαιος translates נָשִׁי׃ "innocent", with reference to persons (Job 9:23; 17:8) and in the phrase αἷμα δίκαιον ("innocent blood", which is usually αἷμα ἁθῶν ) at Prov.6:17 (AS), Joel 4:19 and Jonah 1:14. The noun δικαιοσύνη appears for נִיְנִי׃ at Gen.20:5.

Of interest is the translation by δικαιοσύνη of the Aramaic נְדָר ( "purity" or "blamelessness" before God) at Dan.6:23 (22). The Hebrew verb נָדַר is twice rendered by δικαίω :<sup>3</sup> (1) Micah 6:11 - נָשִׁי׃ נִיְנִי׃ נְדָר where the LXX has εἰ δικαιοθήσεται ἐν βυγῶ ἄνομος. The RSV renders the Hebrew by "Shall I acquit with wicked scales?". Since the reading נְדָר means "Shall I be pure?" and makes

1 Cf. G. Gerleman, Studies in the Septuagint, Job (Lund, 1946) and Proverbs (Lund, 1956); E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, (Oxford, 1889) and H.B. Swete, Introduction to the OT in Greek (Cambridge 1900).

2 This does not mean that the translators violently distorted the OT materials. The content of Job and Proverbs was less characteristically Israelite from the beginning and therefore a measure of assimilation to Greek ethical ideas was easier.

3 G. Schrenk, op.cit., p.2 includes Ps.51(50):6 among the cases of נָדַר being translated by δικαίω . In fact δικαιοθήσ there renders נָדַר , and נְדָר appears as νικήσης ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε .



poor sense, it seems likely that the pointing should be altered to  $\text{נִדְּחַן}$  (Piel) or to  $\text{נִדְּחַן}$  (Hiphil). If the Hiphil was the reading the translator had before him, then the meaning is "Shall I cause to be, or declare to be, pure (righteous)" and that is adequately represented (when turned into the passive) by  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . The Piel means "cleansed", but in later Hebrew is often used with the sense "to acquit" or "to pronounce righteous".<sup>1</sup> Knowledge of this meaning may well have influenced the translator in his rendering. (ii) at Ps. 73 (72): 13  $\text{רִיק זַבְיֹנִי בְּבִרְבִּי}$  is rendered by  $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\tau\eta\nu \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon$ . The Hebrew clearly means "I have cleansed (i.e. kept clean) my heart in vain", but the Greek will not easily yield that sense. Here again the translator was perhaps influenced (wrongly) by the developing declaratory meaning of the Piel and chose  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$  to convey that sense, rather than some part of the verb  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ . If this is not the case, we have here the only instance of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$  in the LXX with the meaning "to cleanse", "make pure or righteous".

The Hebrew word  $\text{נִדְּחַן}$  is translated by  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$  on nine occasions.<sup>2</sup> Since this term meant "an act of kind-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. b Berak. 19a; Jer. Sot. 8, 22c, 41; Midr. Ps. 143.1, 266b etc. See SB, III, p. 134 on Rom. 3:4 for examples. Koehler-Baumgartner's Lexicon (sub  $\text{נִדְּחַן}$ ) understands the verb here as Hiphil, and render it "für rein erklären"

<sup>2</sup> Gen. 19:19, 20:13, 21:23, 24:27, 32:10; Ex. 15:13, 34:7; Prov. 20:28 and Is. 63:7.



ness or loyalty (between persons)" or "the steadfast loyal love" (of Yahweh to his people), we are confronted with a meaning which lies outside the scope of what *δικαιοσύνη* connoted to the Greek mind. Perhaps we may find in this translation a recognition of the fact that *רָצוֹן* was not conceived of entirely as a spontaneous feeling, but in terms of "what is to be expected" or "what is right or just" within a relationship: *רָצוֹן* was always governed by the objective fact of relation, and therefore the rendering *δικαιοσύνη* may be a more adequate means of communicating that idea than the word *ἔλεος*.<sup>1</sup> Another covenant word which *δικαιοσύνη* and *δίκαιος* render is *נִדָּן* (usually translated *ἀλήθεια*). Some of these occurrences (there are 10 in all) refer to the faithfulness or constancy of Yahweh: one means "security" (Is.39:8); while in two places (Ezek.18:8 and Zech.7:9) *נִדָּן* *עֲלֵי* ("judgment of truth or faithfulness") becomes *δίκαιον κρίμα*. In these two cases the forensic reference is dominant in the Greek term; as it is when *δικαιοσύνη* translates *עֲלֵי* itself, Is.61:8, Mal.2:17.

The verb *δικαίω* is used twice to render a form of *נָדָן*, at Is.1:17 and Mic.7:9. *נָדָן* properly means "to contend" and especially "to conduct legal proceedings". It is used in a favourable and in an unfavourable sense, but

<sup>1</sup> The translation of *רָצוֹן* by *δικαιοσύνη* may be evidence of the growing legalism of the period in which the LXX was written, see Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p.65.



in the two passages where it is translated δικαιόω it bears the sense "vindicate".<sup>1</sup> Again δικαιόω appears once (Ezek. 21:13, MT and LXX, 18) to render יָבַח the Pual of יָבַח ("to test, try") and the meaning seems to be, "it has been tested, trial has been made". Apart from these instances δικαιόω translates the verb פָּטַח

We now look at the way in which δικαιόω is used to render the various parts of the verb פָּטַח. The Hiph'il פָּטַח, in which the declaratory and forensic connotation is most dominant, is without exception translated by the active of δικαιόω. Snaith claims that "the forensic sense does not appear to have been as obvious to the LXX translator of Proverbs 17:15 as it is to the moderns, for there the Greek rendering (of the Hiph'il participle) is δίκαιον κρίνειν, i.e. the actual verb 'judge' is inserted in order to make clear the forensic sense."<sup>2</sup> But surely the reason for this is simply the desire for symmetry in style. The translator wanted a verb which could be used in both halves of the sentence and δικαιόω could not be so used. Occasionally the active of δικαιόω is used to translate the Piel of פָּטַח, meaning "make appear righteous". For example, at

1 Snaith, op.cit., p.166 and Schrenk, op.cit., p.58 claim that at 1 Sam 12:7 δικαιόω renders וַיִּשְׁפֹּט. Of the LXX mss. only A (generally regarded as unreliable) gives δικαιώσω. All others give δικάσω (fut. of δικάζω = "judge") which renders וַיִּשְׁפֹּט ten times in 1 Sam., while וַיִּשְׁפֹּט is nowhere else in the OT translated by δικαιόω.

2 Snaith, op.cit., p.166.



Jer.3:11, where the idea is that of making one's self appear innocent or righteous in comparison with another who is more guilty, and at Ezek.16:51, where the meaning is "to make another person appear righteous" by being bad oneself. In so far as the meanings made necessary by the Hebrew are close to the Hiph'il idea of "putting in the right", it is safe to say that an underlying forensic idea is present in them and in the translation by δικαιώω.

More interesting is the use of the middle and passive of δικαιώω to translate the Qal of קָדַשׁ, meaning "to appear righteous", "to be in the right", even "to be righteous".<sup>1</sup> An important example is found in Ps.143 (LXX 142):2. The Hebrew reads:

וְלֹא יָבִיטָהּ אֵינֹכָהּ לְפָנַי. כִּי לֹא יִשְׁפָּט אִישׁ אֶת עַמּוּתוֹ  
and the LXX: καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου, ὅτι οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ἄνθρωπος. The RSV translates, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no man living is righteous before thee." (Cf. Gal.2:16, Rom. 3:20). Other instances are Gen.38:26; Ps.19(18):9 (Heb. and LXX,10); Ps.51(50):4 (Heb. and LXX, 6), Is.43:9,26; 45:25; also Job 10:15 (Aquil.) Job 22:3 (Sym.) and Job 15:14 (Aquil. and Theod.). Moreover it is possible that the passive of

<sup>1</sup> In JBL, LXXIII, (1954) p.87 E.J. Goodspeed pointed out that "Edward Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the NT (current about a century ago) says of the middle of this verb δικαιώω: "to make oneself upright", hence "to be upright, righteous". He claims that this usage has been ignored by later lexicographers.



δικαιῶ was used in this way to translate the Qal of פָּטַח in passages of the Apocrypha, of which the original Hebrew is no longer extant.<sup>1</sup> Now this use of the passive of δικαιῶ where the Hebrew means "appear righteous, be righteous etc." is important. Does it mean, as some scholars assert,<sup>2</sup> that δικαιούσθαι has lost its forensic or judicial sense? In answering this, we must recognise the fact that the Qal of פָּטַח which it renders generally possesses a forensic significance. For example, in the verse from Ps.143, the Hebrew does not mean "no one shall be righteous in himself" but "no one shall be righteous before God, i.e. in the right at the divine tribunal,"<sup>3</sup> The idea of the confirmation of man's "in the right-ness" at some court of appeal (even that offered by the demands of convention, Gen.38:26) is present also at Is.43:9,26 and 45:25. In Psalm 51 the suggestion of Yahweh's being "in the right" in passing sentence is expressed.<sup>4</sup> Now if we can assume that the Greek translators knew the force of the Qal of פָּטַח, we may go on

1 See N.M. Watson, "Some observations on the use of δικαιῶ in the Septuagint", JBL, LXXIX, (1960) pp. 255-66, especially pp. 262ff.

2 Snaith, loc.cit., and M.J. Lagrange, Épître aux Romains, (Paris, 1931) p.127.

3 Skinner, op.cit., p.273 "Righteousness... is apt to be looked on as in itself controvertible and incomplete until it has been confirmed by what is equivalent to a judicial sentence."

4 At Ps.19:10 the Heb.says "The Ordinances of the Lord are righteous ( פָּטַח )" and the LXX has δεικνύμενα. This strange translation, where δίκαια would have been enough, may have been adopted for metrical reasons or for the sake



on to suggest that they found its particular shade of meaning ("to be in the right") best rendered by this passive form of the Greek verb. Nevertheless, we must add that it does not follow that the passive of δικάι<sup>ω</sup> always and necessarily bore that specific nuance in Biblical Greek. Once it had been used to translate "be righteous" in contexts where there was emphasis on the confirmation of rightness, it could easily be transferred to render "be righteous" when that particular emphasis was not present.<sup>1</sup>

From this discussion of LXX usage it will be obvious that the δίκαιος -words underwent considerable expansion and change of meaning through being consistently used to render the Hebrew root  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$ . 1. In the first place, δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη became words associated with God, both in the general sense that He did what was right, and more particularly in the sense that he discriminated in his attitude towards and in his dealings with the righteous and the sinner. It was otherwise in Classical Greek usage, where δίκαιος etc. were not terms used of the Divine, except at a very early date. 2. In classical usage the idea of conformity to a standard was present in the term, but the standard was predominantly that of social obligation, the of symmetry, to retain an adj. and participle in both parts of the verse.

1 N.M. Watson, op.cit., p.265 draws attention to some passages in Tobit and Ecclesiastes. (behind which may lie the Qal of  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$ ) which use the passive of δικάι<sup>ω</sup> in the sense "be righteous", where no idea of "being in the right" is present. In these cases, δίκαιος + the verb "to be" might have been a more satisfactory rendering.



demand to be a good citizen. When the idea of conformity to convention is present in the OT, the convention is regarded as supported by divine authority, and, in general, the standard is the divine will expressed in the demands of the covenant law. Among the Greeks this sense of divine requirement was weak, but, through being used as the means of translating the Hebrew  $\text{קִדְּשׁ}$ , the word  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  in Biblical Greek gained this new dimension of reference.

3. Through being drawn into the covenant terminology the word  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  was supplied, from time to time, with a content which is related to "mercy" (when translating  $\text{רַחֲמִים}$ ) and to "loyalty" and "trustworthiness" (when translating  $\text{אֱמֻנָה}$ ). 4. The verb  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$  is not found with its secular Greek meanings in the LXX. Its meaning there is entirely in terms of the Hebrew roots it renders. When it translates  $\text{קִדְּשׁ}$ , and even when it translates other roots, the forensic idea is almost always present. The only possible exceptions we have found are in Ps. 19:9 and 73:13.

#### IV. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

In the Apocryphal books  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is used as in the LXX, except that there are no examples of the meanings "in the right" and "innocent".<sup>1</sup> In the Psalms of Solomon  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ,

<sup>1</sup> The meaning "righteous" (applied to man and God, as well as to actions) is found at Tob.3:2, 14:9; Wisd. 2:10, 3:1; Sir.10:23. The meaning "just" occurs at Wisd. 12:15, 2 Mac. 9:18. The use of the neuter in the sense "just", that which is right, one's rights or deserts is frequent, 1 Mac. 7:12, 11:33; 2 Mac.11:14, 13:23.



when applied to men, designates the "upright" who trust in God and keep his law, as distinct from sinners (2:38, 3:4-8, and 15:8). When applied to God and his judgments, it designates Him as righteously discriminating between the righteous and the sinner (2:12,19,36,38; 5:1; 8:8; 9:4 and 10:6). It is applied to the Messiah in a similar sense (17:35). The use of δικαιοσύνη in Ps.Sol. corresponds to these two uses of δίκαιος. The "righteousness" of men is their good conduct in obedience to the law, which makes them acceptable to God (1:2; 5:20; 9:9 - ὁ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην θησουργεῖ σωτὴν ἑαυτῷ παρὰ κυρίῳ - and 14:1). The "righteousness" of God is manifested in his discrimination between the righteous (δίκαιοι) and the wicked, saving the saints and punishing the sinners (2:16). The Messiah possesses a similar discriminating righteousness, including also personal freedom from sin (17: 41,42). In the Apocryphal books δικαιοσύνη appears to have all the usages of the same word in the LXX. It is the "righteousness" and "right conduct" on the part of man that makes him acceptable to God, though that "righteousness" is conceived of in a more external, legalistic way than in the prophets, cf. Tob.12:9; 14:11; Wisd.1:15. There are instances of the term being applied to God to denote his "righteousness" in discriminating between the good and the evil among men, saving the one and punishing the other, cf. Wisd.5:18; 12:16.



One unusual description of δικαιοσύνη appears at Wisdom 15:3, where knowledge of God constitutes righteousness: τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί σε ὁλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἶδέναι σου τὸ κράτος ρίψα ἀθανασίας. In this statement the author describes in terms of one act or moral attitude the content of "righteousness", that which makes a man acceptable to God and secures immortality.<sup>1</sup>

In Sirach δικαίω means (1) "to do justice to" and "to punish" (the sinner), 42:2; and (11) "to recognise or declare to be right or righteous", 7:5; 10:29; 13:22. The verb frequently appears in the passive with the meaning "to be declared innocent" or "acquit" or even possibly "to accept" (18:22). The Ps. Sol. never use the verb in the sense of "to justify (man)" but exclusively in the sense "to recognise as just or righteous" and with reference to man's recognition of the righteousness of God and his judgments (2:16; 3:3,5; 4:9; 8:7, 27,31 and 9:3).<sup>2</sup>

#### v. Philo Judaeus

The writings of Philo reveal a lively interest in δικαιοσύνη as one of the cardinal virtues. Linked with φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία and sometimes εὐσέβεια, the virtue of

<sup>1</sup> Here, and at Wisd.14:7 and 1 Mac.2:52, δικαιοσύνη is used with such special emphasis on the idea that "righteousness" is the basis of acceptance with God and consequent salvation, that the word is almost equivalent to "acceptance with God" or "condition of salvation".

<sup>2</sup> The same idea is often expressed in Rabbinic literature by ר' זין or ר' ז (bab.Ber.19a, Sif.Deut.307 on 32:4, etc.)



δικαιοσύνη (which is obviously "justice" rather than "righteousness") receives excessive praise. It gives rest to the soul and relieves it of the sorrows which arise out of our misdirected activity, since it makes us indifferent to those twin causes of vexation, wealth and glory, and is a sovereign remedy against wickedness. (Deter.121-23). The righteous man (ὁ δίκαιος) is "the foundation (ῥεῖσμα) on which mankind rests" (Migr.121): therefore, "let us pray that there may constantly remain for the healing of our maladies the righteous mind in the soul, and in the human race, the righteous man" (Migr.124). The effect of δικαιοσύνη in the soul is not only healing, but also peace (Deter.122) and joy (Leg.All.III,247), with righteous reasoning (δίκαιος λογισμὸς) and asceticism (Deter.121f.).

Philo takes over from Pythagoreanism the idea that equality (ἰσότης) is the "mother" of justice (Spec. IV, 231, Plant.122, Heres 163). Being so derived, δικαιοσύνη is the ordering principle in the human soul and in life. The ultimate origin of justice, however, as of all virtues, is God (Spec.Leg.I,277) and Philo applies δίκαιος to God e.g. Somn.II, 194. The only occasions on which he speaks of the "righteousness or justice of God" are (i) Immut. 79 where it is listed (in Stoic fashion) among the other virtues, and (ii) Mos.II, 237, "God can distinguish by infallible and absolutely unerring tests the finest differ-



ences (in matters of judgment) and thereby shows his truth and justice (πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν ἀληθείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ). Although the words are parallel to Rom.3:25ff the terms do not have their Pauline meaning: they refer rather to God's impartiality and ability to judge truly. Indeed much of Philo's usage possesses a legal reference: e.g. Spec.IV,143, the Lawgiver Moses left nothing out which can give possession of justice, whole and complete (πρὸς... μετουσίαν δικαιοσύνης ).

Faith, for Philo, is a δίκαιον , a species of the virtue of justice towards God, just as in Greek philosophy fear and holiness are regarded as justice towards the gods. "Nothing is so just or righteous ( δίκαιον ) as to put on God alone a trust which is pure and unalloyed" (Heres 94). The patriarchs who displayed this merit (especially Abraham and Noah) were counted righteous. Thus Hellenistic ethics are blended with the OT description of the godly man as "the righteous" ( צ'דק ). The virtue of faith, however, is for Philo a work or product ( ἔργον ) of δικαιοσύνη <sup>1</sup> and ideas of merit are certainly present.

Everyone who rests from sin and unrighteous acts and rests on what is noble and lives in fellowship with righteousness finds favour with God.

But that means more than that he is found well-pleasing, for

The righteous man, exploring the nature of existence, makes the surprising find that

<sup>1</sup> In one place only (Spec.Leg.IV,181) δικαιοσύνη appears to mean "righteous acts".



all things are a grace of God, and that creation has no gifts of grace to bestow. . . since grace belongs to God alone. Leg.All.III, 77-78.

The noun *δικαιώματα* appears twice in Philo: at Deter.68 where it means "legal statutes", and at Dec.109 where it seems to connote "acts of justice".

## VI. The Dead Sea Scrolls

Apart from numerous occurrences in the many small fragments discovered at Qumran, the root *ṣḏ* appears more than 120 times in the four main documents associated with the Sect, the Manual of Discipline (1QS), the Damascus Document (CD), the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH) and the War Scroll (1QM). Such frequent use of the term is not surprising in the writings of a community whose original leader or founder was called the "Teacher of Righteousness" (*ṣḏ ḥḏ*), whose members could refer to themselves as the "sons of righteousness" (*ṣḏ בנ*), whose expectations were fastened on God's vindicating righteousness, and whose mission was "to practise truth, righteousness and justice in the land" (*ḥḏ ḥḏ ḥḏ*) 1QS 1.5; 5.4 and 8.2.

The title "Moreh Sedeq" or "Moreh Has-sedeq" may mean either (i) "righteous teacher"<sup>1</sup> or (ii) "teacher of righteousness". In the latter case, *ṣḏ* could refer either to (1) moral uprightness and standards of conduct, or to

<sup>1</sup> The genitive of the noun in the construct case admits of interpretation as a subjective genitive.



(ii) deliverance, salvation, as in Deutero-Isaiah. Now it is true that the Moreh Sedeq taught his followers and disciples the way of salvation and redemption, as well as inculcating moral righteousness, and consequently many scholars have accepted the last-mentioned interpretation. Nevertheless, it may be that the correct understanding of the title lies along a different path. The Hebrew root appears to have had as its original connotation the idea of legitimacy or rightfulness, that against which no case can be made out, and this notion lingered in the various derived forms throughout much of the OT usage. It seems probable, therefore, that the name Moreh Sedeq means "the right teacher", i.e. the legitimate one, in contradistinction to a teacher (or priest) with falsely assumed rights. This interpretation is consonant with the names given to his opponents ("the man of mockery", "the man of deception") but it is no more than a suggestion: the title is ambiguous and one cannot be dogmatic in its explanation.<sup>1</sup> The desig-

<sup>1</sup> Among those scholars who take the view suggested are J.L. Teicher, JJS, II, (1951) p.97, F.M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, (London, 1958) p.83 and J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, (London, 1959) p.76. Cf. A.M. Honeyman, JJS, IV, (1953) p.131 "The term sedeq refers not to the moral content of his instruction but to the legitimacy of his status and the authenticity of his leadership, to the "rightness" of his office rather than to the uprightness of his exhortations". A parallel is offered in מִשְׁכֵּן הַצִּדִּיק (4Q Patriarchal Blessings 1.3) which means the "right, true or legitimate Messiah". J. Weingreen, "The Title Moreh Sedek", JSS, VI, (1961) pp.162-74, discusses the use of the two words in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew and



nation of the Community as  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹת}$  (1QM 1.8, 13:10; 1QS 3.20) may mean that they were the "disciples of the right one", i.e. of the right teacher, or that they were a company devoted to the ideal of true righteousness, who thus prepare the victory of God's righteousness.<sup>1</sup>

The Qumran writings frequently reiterate the prophetic emphasis on the righteousness of God. He is righteous in all his deeds (1QH 1.6): His guidance (1QH 9.33) and His counsel (1QS 1.13) are righteous: His acts of mercy and unmerited benevolence are called  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹת}$  (1QS 1.21, 10.23 11.3): at 1QM 18.8 He is designated  $\text{אלהי הצדק}$  "God of righteousness", in that he has redeemed his people by keeping the covenant unto them and opening for them the gates of salvation.<sup>2</sup> As well as being the activity of God, "righteousness" is also his character. This finds expression

concludes that (169)  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹת}$  has the effect of an adj. and is to be interpreted as "true" in the sense of genuine. "It expresses the idea of one publicly recognised in his title to office and in the exercise of his accredited functions. In this association the noun  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹת}$  has no moral content at all: it is part of a conventional title and conveys the idea of legitimacy". He explains  $\text{מִשְׁכֵּל הַמֶּלֶךְ}$  as designating judicial authority. "The man who bore the title was the spiritual, judicial and political leader of his community, but no conclusions can be drawn from the fact that it was applied to the head of the Qumran community with regard to his character and qualities. These must be deduced from other sources" (p.174).

1 1QH 2.13 refers to the members of the sect as "the chosen of righteousness".  $\text{קִדְּשׁוֹת}$  here is not a human ethical ideal: the members were not chosen in virtue of their own righteousness. The term refers to God's righteous judgment, dividing between the ungodly and those devoted to the truth, cf. 1QH 7.12.

2 Cf. B. Jongeling, Le Rouleau de la Guerre des Mss. de Qumran, (Assen, 1962) p.370.



particularly in the Hymns of Thanksgiving. "Thy righteousness endureth for ever" (1QH 8.2); "there is none righteous beside thee" (1QH 12.19, 16.9) in the sense that God has the right on his side to such an extent that none can measure himself up alongside Him.<sup>1</sup>

How can a man return an answer to any righteous judgment;

Unto thee, Thou God of knowledge, are all the deeds of righteousness (צדקה) 1QH 1.26

and again at 12.31:

Neither is it possible to give an answer to the judgment

For Thou art righteous and there is none beside thee.

and even more significantly at 1QH 9.15f:

None is justified<sup>2</sup> in thy judgment (לֹא יִצְדָּק כּוֹל) בְּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ

And none[may stand in] thy assize  
[Against thy strength] none may measure himself  
up in power.

Now the declaration that righteousness belongs to God alone causes a corresponding emphasis on the frailty and sinfulness of man, and this also is a striking feature of Hodayot.<sup>3</sup>

The author declares that he has no works of righteousness (אֵין צְדָקוֹת), 7.17: he declares "I know that none can be righteous (verb) apart from thee", i.e. without God's will

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran, (Aarhus 1960) p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> The Hiphil of the verb is used at 1QM 11.14 in the sense of "vindication": God has shown how just the judgments of his faithfulness are for the sons of men. See J. Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre (Paris, 1958) p.166.

<sup>3</sup> See J.P. Hyatt, "The View of Man in the Qumran Hodayot", NTS, II, (1955-56) pp.276-84.



and help, (16.11); he goes on to beseech God "by that spirit which thou has given me, to fulfil thy mercy towards (thy servant). . . and to cleanse me with thy holy spirit". This note of what we may call "evangelical piety" is sounded all through the Hymns. The awareness of the weakness of unaided human nature forms the background for the assertion of trust in the mercy of God and in his spirit to guide and direct all life and conduct. Two passages give typical expression to this deeply spiritual theme.

I know that righteousness is not unto man (לאב) (לֹא-בְיָדֵינוּ צִדִּיקָה)

Neither unto the son of man the perfect way.

To the Most High God belong all the deeds of righteousness,

And the way of man cannot be made firm

Except by the spirit which God has formed for him,

To perfect a way for the children of men,

That they may know all his deeds by his mighty power,

And the multitude of His mercies

Over all the children of his good pleasure.

And as for me, trembling and quaking laid hold on me  
And all my bones shook. . .

When I remembered my guilt and the wickedness of  
my forefathers.

But I remembered the strength of thy hand and the  
multitude of thy mercies

I was restored and stood upright...

I leaned on thy compassion and thy abundant mercies,

For thou atonest for sin and (purifiest) from guilt  
through thy righteousness. 1QH 4.30ff.

and at 1QH 7.28ff.:

Who is there that is righteous before thee,  
when thou bringest him to judgment (חִי יֵצֵא לְפָנֶיךָ) (לִפְנֵיכָהּ בְּהַשְׁכֵּטוֹ)

None is able to withstand thy wrath.

But all the children of thy truth

Thou leadest into forgiveness in thy presence,



To cleanse them from their sins in the abundance  
of thy goodness,<sup>1</sup>  
And by the multitude of thy mercies to set them  
in thy presence for ever.

The acknowledgement of sinfulness and the confidence in God's forgiving mercy which is expressed in these verses comes close to the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, but, as M. Black has pointed out,<sup>2</sup> "such religious sentiments do not only anticipate the Gospels as praeparatio evangelica; they are a continuation of Psalmenfrömmigkeit, the sense of profound trust in God's mercy in the Psalms, and in the prophets, especially attributed to the Hasidim".

The deep spiritual insights characteristic of the Hodayot find expression in a significant passage in the Manual of Discipline, 11.3ff and 10ff.

My justification ( מִשְׁפָּט<sup>3</sup> ) belongs to God,  
The perfection of my way and the uprightness  
of my heart are in his hand;  
Through his righteous acts ( בְּצִדְקוֹתָי ) shall  
my sins be blotted out. . . .

As for me I belong to an evil humanity  
And to the company of wicked flesh.  
Mine iniquities, my transgressions, my sin...  
Belong to ... the things that move in darkness.

1 Cf. IQM 11.30 "Gladden the soul of thy servant with thy truth and cleanse him in thy righteousness ( בְּצִדְקַתְּכָה )" also 13.17 "Only by thy goodness can a man deal rightly or be righteous ( וְרַק בְּטוֹבָךְ יֵצֵק אִישׁ )".

2 M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, (Edinburgh 1961) p.128.

3 "Justification" is the usual rendering of the word here, but probably it would be more correct to render "the judgment, which, in fact, justifies". The sentence which is given by God is one which "justifies" man.



For a man's way is not his own,  
 A man cannot direct his steps (cf. Jer. 10:23)  
 But to God belongs justification (משפט)  
 And from his hand comes perfection of way. . .  
 As for me, if I stumble, God's mercies shall  
     come to my help for ever,  
 If I fall because of the sin of the flesh (בשר בצוון)<sup>1</sup>  
 My justification (משפט) shall be established  
     through God's righteousness (בצדקת אל) for ever.....  
 With righteousness and truth (בצדקת אמתו) He  
     has judged and justified me ( )  
 And in his great goodness he will atone (יכפר) for  
     all my iniquities,  
 In his righteousness (בצדקתו) he will cleanse me  
     from the impurity of man  
 And from the sin of the children of men

On this last verse Millar Burrows remarks, "In this verse we seem to have not only justification but sanctification"<sup>2</sup> and adds, "The point of prime importance here is that while man has no righteousness of his own, there is a righteousness which God, in his own righteousness, freely confers. The meaning of the righteousness of God in Rom. 11.21-26 is thus illustrated and shown to be rooted in pre-Christian Judaism."<sup>3</sup>

The language of the passage quoted from the Manual is interesting. The act of justification clearly has a forensic reference adhering to it in the use of the noun משפט (usually translated in the LXX by κρίμα or κρίσις) and

<sup>1</sup> "Flesh" is probably used, as in Paul, for the seat of wickedness, rather than for the physical body. The change in man's nature is not in the ontological but in the moral realm. See W.D. Davies: Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit, in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed K. Stendahl (London, 1958).

<sup>2</sup> Cited by W.H. Brownlee, BASOR, Supp. Stud. 10-12 p.45.

<sup>3</sup> The Dead Sea Scrolls, (New York, 1955) p.334.



the verb  $\text{טָּוַע}$ . That in which justification is grounded is God's  $\text{צְדָקָה}$ .<sup>1</sup> Although the two roots  $\text{טָּוַע}$  and  $\text{צָדַק}$  are in close relationship, the former is constantly applied to the actual justifying judgment<sup>2</sup> (the verb  $\text{טָּוַע}$  does not mean "to make righteous") and the latter to the attitude or character of God's righteousness.

Returning to the thought of the passage from 1QS, we can see that the justification and cleansing of the sinner lies in the grace and mercy of God: it is accepted by man unworthily but joyfully. The whole atmosphere is one of deep faith and trust, even though the writer does not speculate on his own faith and its value. The faith is here placed in God (as in Psalms), but in other parts of the Scrolls there is expressed a faith or confidence in the Law and in the specific revelation brought by the Sect. With this we come to the passage in the Habakkuk commentary (8.1ff) on the famous text, Hab.2:4.

Its interpretation concerns all those who practise the law in the house of Judah whom God will deliver from the house of judgment because of their suffering and their fidelity to (or faith in) the Teacher of Righteousness.

<sup>1</sup> The noun  $\text{צְדָקָה}$  is used, together with  $\text{טָּוַע}$ , at 1QS 1.5, 5. 4; 8.2 for the ideal or way of life to which the sect's members must devote themselves. This clearly means ethical uprightness and general standards of conduct. We shall see that for Paul also  $\text{δικαιοσύνη}$ , while referring specifically to God's righteousness and salvation, did connote the ethical righteousness of the believer's life.

<sup>2</sup> In Paul,  $\text{δικαίωμα}$  or  $\text{δικαίωσις}$  would seem to correspond to  $\text{טָּוַע}$  here.



Whether we translate "fidelity to" or "faith in"<sup>1</sup> the Teacher, the passage is significant in that it shows that Paul's famous text had already been used to refer to the relationship of persons to an historic-authoritative teacher.

By way of conclusion to this brief study of "righteousness" in the Scrolls, we may say that the new materials from Qumran reveal that the issue of justification and the means whereby God accepts the sinner were matters of lively concern within pre-Christian sectarian Judaism.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Fidelity" is the most natural way to render the word in Hab. and in the peshar. Burrows (loc.cit.,) thinks that fidelity is meant, but also confidence in the Teacher and a belief about him. He claims that the same three elements are included also in what Paul means by "faith" in Christ, but that the belief about Christ which is necessary for salvation goes much further than what was believed about the Teacher of righteousness - and the extra is the belief in the redemptive work of Christ. Recently however, claims are being made for some kind of redemptive function for the founder of the Sect. These are based on the identification of the speaker in the Hymns with this figure (the Teacher). The language used may indeed suggest a pre-Christian Jewish martyr-cult. On this see M. Black, op.cit., pp.160-61.

<sup>2</sup> For a study of the relations of Pauline doctrine to the contents of the Manual, see Sherman E. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline," HTR, XLVIII, (1955). pp.157-66.



VII. The Rabbinic Literature.

By way of introduction to the study of the terminology and thought of later Judaism on "righteousness" we may take notice of the Rabbinical treatment of Deut. 33:21, where, with reference to Gad, the Blessing of Moses says:

He chose the best of the land for himself,  
for there a commander's portion was reserved;  
And he came to the heads of the people (?),  
With Israel he executed the commands and  
just decrees of the Lord. (RSV).

MT. צִדְקַת יְהוָה צָשָׂה וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו צִם - יִשְׂרָאֵל ...

It seems probable that the passage refers to the events of Num.32 when Reuben and Gad chose fertile land on the east side of Jordan and prepared to settle there: at the command of Yahweh (made known through Moses) they agreed to cross Jordan, win land for their fellow-tribes from the Canaanites and then return to their chosen territory.<sup>1</sup> With this in mind, we may interpret צִדְקַת יְהוָה either as (i) the "justice" of Yahweh, i.e. his "just" action for Israel in the dispossession of the Canaanites, or more probably as (ii) his "just decision, or command", i.e. the obligation placed on Gad to continue fighting before settling down. The LXX appears to have overlooked the construct state in the phrase and so translates: δίκαιος ὢν κύριος ἐποίησεν καὶ κρίσιν

<sup>1</sup> The suitability of this context to the content of the blessing suggests that v.21b need not be placed after v.4 (referring to Moses), as some scholars think. Mid.Num.XIII, 19 gives Num.32 as the reference against which to explain Moses' blessing of Gad.



αὐτοῦ μετὰ Ἰσραὴλ . The Rabbinic interpretation of the verse regards Moses as the subject (possibly because he was buried in or near the territory of Gad and had walked faithfully before Yahweh) but their rendering of the words צדקת יהוה עשה is instructive. Sifre Deut.355 expounds the phrase in terms of the blessings or benefits which Moses (after the manner of Yahweh himself) had shown to the people, especially his concern for the poor (cf. Deut. 15:7ff). This shows clearly the influence of the common interpretation of צדקה as "act of charity", "benevolence" "almegiving". The Fragment Targum (ed. M. Ginsburger, pp.68 and 90) renders it literally, זכותא דה' עבר "He carried out the righteousness of Yahweh". Both the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Targum Onkelos give a somewhat extended version: the former (ed. Ginsburger, p.364) has מטול רזכון קדם ה' עבר and the latter (ed. A. Berliner, p.238), זכון קדם ה' עבר, זכון קדם ה' עבר : both of these mean "he wrought righteousness before the Lord".

It is significant that צדקת יהוה could be interpreted in Jewish commentary as "righteousness before God" and A. Oepke has made this the basic point in an argument to prove that δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ at Rom.1:17 (assuming Paul's knowledge of Rabbinic exegesis) means "the righteousness of man in the eyes of God".<sup>1</sup> Apart from other considerations,

<sup>1</sup> "Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ bei Paulus in neuer Beleuchtung" TLZ, LXXVIII, (1953) pp. 257-264.



this thesis may be questioned on the basis of the frequency with which the Rabbis rendered צדקת' as "זכותא before God." To substantiate his claim Oepke would have to show that this was a common practice. But in Judges 5:11 and 1 Sam.12:7 צדקת' and צדקת are rendered in T. Jonathan by זכותא דיו' i.e. righteousness of God.<sup>1</sup> In fact the interpretation of Deut.33:21 may be unique and may be due to the association of the verse with the figure of Moses whom Rabbinic exegesis always wished to exalt.

In this passage we find צדקה rendered by a part of the root זכה (זכא). This root is found in the OT (Mic.6:11; Ps. 73:13, LXX δικαιώω ; Ps.119:9, LXX καταρθώω, and Job 25:4, LXX ἀποκαθαρίξω ) usually with the meaning "cleanse". In discussing Mic.6:11 we pointed out that in later Jewish writing the Piel of the verb was used with the sense "acquit, pronounce righteous", a verdict which God might give at the Day of Atonement (Pesik. Rab.40.169a), at death (bab.Erub.19a) or at the last judgment, on the grounds of a preponderance of good works (Mid.Ps.143:1, 266b; Targ.Ps.51:4(6)). Jastrow's dictionary<sup>2</sup> lists the various meanings which the verb might have: (1) Qal - "to

<sup>1</sup> A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic: Vol.2 The Targum Jonathan to the Former prophets, (Leiden, 1959). At these two places he notes no variants in the other Targumim. I have not been able to check the rendering of צדקת' at any other places.

<sup>2</sup> Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature, (London and New York, 1903).



be acquitted", "be in the right"; occasionally "to be worthy or privileged" and "to benefit another by one's merit": (ii) Piel - "to acquit", "to transfer divine favour", and, in a more theological sense "to lead to righteousness", "to convert", "to make purer and better" (cf. Aboth 5:18). The noun possesses four main senses (i) acquittal, favourable judgment; (ii) doing good, blessing;<sup>1</sup> (iii) the protecting and atoning influence of good conduct, merit; and (iv) advantage, privilege, benefit. Both in the verb and in the noun the pattern of thought indicated by the development of meaning would seem to be as follows: in order to win the favour of God, right conduct is essential; one's own righteousness may be supplemented by the merit achieved by others, which thus becomes a source of benefit or advantage to them. Whether or not this is the chronological order of development,<sup>2</sup> it is at least logical, and the ideas mentioned certainly belong to Rabbinic thought. While remembering that many Rabbinical conclusions are mere homiletic application of texts illustrating the exegetical dexterity of their authors, rather than fixed dogmas of the synagogue, we may say, with confidence that, because of their belief in the justice of

<sup>1</sup> It is probably under this head that the word יִצְחָק in the Targumim to Deut. 33:21 would come.

<sup>2</sup> Rabbinic theology is never systematic, and chronological development would be extremely hard to assess.



God, the Rabbis assumed that the actions of a man form an important factor in the scheme of his salvation, whether for good or evil. Hence we find the declaration that man is judged according to the dominant character of his intentions and deeds (Kid.40d). If the majority of these are righteous then he is accounted a "righteous" man ( צדיק ), but if they are otherwise, or if even a few partake of the nature of gross crimes and immoralities, he is adjudged רשע (cf. Sifre 51b). It is important to notice the emphasis laid on "intention" ( כוונה ). We are guilty of a shallow understanding of Jewish ethics and religion if we underestimate the seriousness of the demand for the direction of a man's heart and mind towards God, both in worship and in action. The intention to do a good act has value, whether or not the action is carried out, since there is present the desire to obey: it is the intention to do wrong which makes the wrong act really bad.<sup>1</sup> Now, in intending and carrying out the good act, it is necessary (according to Jewish teaching) to repress the "evil impulse" ( יצר הרע ) which incites to sin. The chief means of doing this was by the study of the Torah which was the divinely-given remedy for the evil nature of man, the power before which it had to yield. The patriarchs were accounted perfectly righteous partly because they completely repressed the evil inclination (bab.B.B. 16b-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. T.W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel, (London, 1960) pp. 39-41.



17a) and obeyed the good inclination.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of such ideas concerning human achievement in righteousness, it would be true to say that Rabbinic theology, far from encouraging self-righteousness, warns each man to regard himself as partly good and partly evil, and counsels him to seek to determine his own rank by adding, by means of discipline and obedience, to the sum of his own good deeds.

According to Jewish teaching, every good act is a מצוה, a divine command carried out, and every act of obedience earns merit (גמול) for the doer in the sight of God.<sup>2</sup> The spiritual element, however, is not ignored. The good deed should be done without ulterior motive, should be performed for its own sake (לשמה) or for God's sake.

He who makes use of the crown of the Law is rooted out of the world. Do the words of the Law for the doing's sake and speak of them for their own sake. Make them not a crown with which to exalt thyself, or a hoe with which to weed (Ned. 62a)

Calculations of reward and penalty are declared to be contrary to God's intention, (Deut.R.6): these will be the necessary consequences of the good or evil deed and need not be a matter of calculating concern. But even this causal relation is placed within the circumference of God's grace.

<sup>1</sup> An early reference to יצר הטוב ("good inclination") at Test. Asher 1.6 says, "If the soul takes pleasure in the good impulse, all its actions are in righteousness".

<sup>2</sup> According to some of the Rabbis, the Torah had been given in order that Israel might have the opportunity of gaining merit by her obedience to it (Makkoth 3.16).



When strict justice operates, each is judged according to his own merits acquired by his own righteousness, but the mercy of God permits a man to be judged by the sum total of all the goodness which exists in the world, in an age, in a family (cf. Gen.18:22ff). In other words, merits not only benefit the person who acquired them, but also his contemporaries, and, in addition, his ancestors and his posterity, although they have no claim to the advantage.<sup>1</sup> The idea that the good deeds of the pious are stored up as treasure in heaven is found in 2 Bar.24 and in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs,<sup>2</sup> but the first discussion of the topic appears in a conversation between two Rabbis of the 1st century B.C., Shemiah and Abtalion.<sup>3</sup> The problem which exercised their minds was, "What merits did the Israelites possess that God divided the sea before them?" Shemiah says: "Sufficient is the faith with which Abraham their father believed in Me that I should divide the sea unto them, as it is said 'And he believed in God and He counted it unto him (at the sea) for doing charity (with his children)' Gen. 15.6". R. Abtalion says: "Worthy is the faith, they (the Israelites themselves) believed in Me so that I shall divide

<sup>1</sup> See S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, (London, 1909) pp. 170ff, and A. Mamorstein, The Doctrine of Merits in the Old Rabbinical Literature (London, 1920).

<sup>2</sup> T. Levi 13.5; T. Napht.8.5. Cf. Matt.6: 19-20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mamorstein, op.cit., pp. 37ff.



the sea before them, as it is said, 'And the people believed', Exod. 4:31.<sup>1</sup> Two comments may be made on this discussion. It is significant that, at the head of an historical review of the doctrine, we find emphasis laid, not on works and external ceremonies, but on the merit of faith to produce an event of national importance. Secondly, the difference between the two views expressed - self-acquired merit or imputed merit - is important, and throughout the 1st century the Rabbis were divided on this issue. It is obvious that a doctrine which permits the merit of one person to benefit another is open to the abuse of fostering moral laxity, and we know from the NT and from Jewish sources that many in Israel were tempted to rely on the merit of their father Abraham for their salvation.<sup>2</sup> The Rabbis, however, were aware of this and protested against it, many of them (e.g. Abtalion) recognising only self-acquired merit. Hillel tried to take a mediating position, but in time it was the view of Shemaiah (i.e. that the merit of the righteous availed for others) which became generally accepted. The reason for this may well have been that the tragic development of Jewish history in the late 1st and early 2nd centuries A.D. made it natural to appeal to the

<sup>1</sup> Mekilta Beshallah 4. The arbitrary choice of a text to confirm an interpretation and the two-fold value of *יִסְדָּא* "to believe a fact" and "to have faith" resemble Paul's methods.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. 3:9. John 8:33,39. Baba Metzia 7.1.



merits of the faithful in past ages that these might help Israel to victory in her plight.

In conclusion, three points should be noticed concerning this doctrine of merits. The first is to draw attention to Schechter's affirmation that the idea of imputed righteousness (and of imputed sin<sup>1</sup>) "never attained such significance either in Jewish theology or in the Jewish conscience as it is generally assumed."<sup>2</sup> The origin of the doctrine of merits through obedience is ancient, but, the idea of their availability for others is a later development. Secondly, the basis of the doctrine lies, not in the notion of God's justice as exacting, calculating and measuring, but in the idea of the solidarity of all members of the community (and race), past, present and future. Thirdly, and most important, the doctrine is rooted in the conception of the mercy of God.

The attitude of God to men was one of mercy and loving kindness; therefore mercy must characterise the actions of men, since human righteousness must reflect the righteousness of God. Consequently, the righteousness of men (צדקה) was almost exclusively interpreted as being "charity" "acts of benevolence" and "almsgiving". To act thus was to fulfil the Law and therefore to acquire merit. Indeed the

---

<sup>1</sup> This idea originated from the words of the Second Commandment: "visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children".

<sup>2</sup> Schechter, op.cit., p.170.



merit of charity is such that it enables even a sinner to see the Shekinah<sup>1</sup> and to be saved in the judgment. Righteousness in a man's inner life is expressed in gemilut hasidim, i.e. philanthropy (Lev.R.27). Merit could be acquired also by repentance and observances, viz. the keeping of the Sabbath, circumcision, sacrifice and tithes. Within Judaism, however, these could be included in the merits of faith and of Torah, since they were all concerned with carrying out the will of God. The word Torah meant to every Jew all that a man holds dear and holy. The entire history of the Jewish people was the framework within which the Torah could develop: therefore to those who study and spread, deepen and enlarge the ideals laid down in it, there is granted life-lengthening merit, even greater than that of the fathers. But Rabbinic Judaism acknowledged the merit of faith also.<sup>2</sup> "There is no need", said R. Eliezer of Modiin, "to provide for tomorrow, to gather wealth. Have faith in God and he will not forsake you."<sup>3</sup> Because of the merit of faith, miracles happened, the Shekinah rested on Israel and salvation will come to Israel. The merit of faith, especially of faithful works, was regarded as even more

I Tobit 12:9. Mid.Cant.R.

<sup>2</sup> Mamorstein, op.cit., pp.175ff., and J. Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ (Paris, 1934-35) vol.2 p.65.

<sup>3</sup> Mekilta Vay. 3; bab. Sotah 48b; Exod. R. 25.4.



helpful than the merits of the fathers זכות אבות . Now all these merits, Mamorstein claims, are based on three general principles which are the bases of Judaism. "We mean Faith, Works and Love. ... The Torah teaches faith which a Jew has to believe, and leads us to works by which this belief can be kept fresh and alive. Faith must inspire man to action and work must express this faith. The climax of both joined together is loving kindness or charity, צדקה."<sup>1</sup> The same view is expressed by Paul Demann:

Faith, to a Jew, is primarily a submission to the God who commands and a trust in the God who promises, rather than a source of contemplation. ... The problem of the relation between "faith" and "works" does not arise in Judaism. From the very nature of the Torah, which is its centre, Jewish faith can only fully exist when it is embodied in the "works" of the Law.

2

The righteousness which achieves merit in the eyes of God is a duty or obligation, not a privilege. It is the fruit of discipline and obedience. Nevertheless, self-righteousness is not a keynote of Israel's confession, as one of the prayers in the Morning Liturgy of the Jewish Prayer Book - the depository of Israel's piety - makes clear:

Lord of all the worlds, not because of our righteous deeds (צדקות) do we lay our supplications before thee, but because of thine abundant mercies...

3

<sup>1</sup> Mamorstein, op.cit., p.184.

<sup>2</sup> The Jewish Faith (Eng. Trans. London, 1961) p.69.

<sup>3</sup> The Authorised Daily Prayer Book, with Commentary, ed. J.H. Hertz, (London, 1959) p.27.



VIII. The δίκαιος -words in the New Testament

Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels.

We proceed now to the discussion of δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη and δικαίω in the usage of the New Testament, and we begin with the Synoptic Gospels. In the study of the word-complex there, the methods and findings of Form-critical analysis are used in order to discover the context in terms of which the meaning of the words may most adequately be assessed. At one level, that context will be the sentence or group of sentences which comprised the original kernel or main point of the pericope, as created or remembered by the Church in its mission. The insights of Form-criticism may also assist us in discovering whether or not the preaching of the Church has caused, by reason of a particular situation or outlook, some alteration in, or addition to the meaning-in-use of the term. This would appear to be a legitimate application of Form-criticism, since it is essentially a literary method: too often it has departed from its own principles by elevating itself to the level of a definitive historical method. Moreover, in our discussion, we have sought to remember that the particular themes or the apologetic interests which characterise an evangelist's work may be of importance in determining the meaning with which he uses a certain word: the context of meaning is thus extended further. It only remains to say that we have



attempted, as far as possible, to treat separately the occurrences of the words in the various types of Gospel material, the kerygmatic, the parainetic and the eschatological.<sup>1</sup>

A. Δίκαιος with the possible meaning "innocent".

At Matt. 27:4 Judas returns to the chief priests and elders the fee of betrayal with the words ἡμαρτον παραδούς αἷμα ζωόν ("I have sinned in betraying innocent blood") for which there is attested (Θ it, sa, bo, Orig.) an alternative reading αἷμα δίκαιον.<sup>2</sup> In the LXX αἷμα ζωόν translates very frequently the phrase יָדָיִם-צַדִּיקִים with the sense "a victim of unjust violence", but αἷμα δίκαιον is also found rendering the same Hebrew words at Prov. 6:17, Joel 4:19, Jonah 1:19, while δίκαιος = יָדָיִם of persons, at Job 9:23, 17:8. Since there is no suggestion of positive righteousness special to these texts,<sup>3</sup> it is legitimate to infer

1 The study owes much to A. Descamps, Les Justes et la Justice dans les évangiles et le christianisme primitif, (Louvain, 1950) although I differ from him at several points. The linguistic discussions of צַדִּיקִים and δίκαιός in C.H. Dodd's The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 42ff. and in TWNT (Eng. trans. Righteousness: Bible Key Words series) are fundamental to our understanding the NT terms, and that part of their work is constantly assumed here, even though I may differ from the writers on points of exegetical interpretation.

2 There is a second alternative, τοῦ δικαίου (sy<sup>s</sup>). It is possible that the use of δίκαιος here with the def.art. (cf. Acts 3:14) suggests the interpretation of Jesus as "the righteous one" or "the righteous-suffering one" par excellence.

3 The distinction between "righteous" and "innocent" may at times be rather fine. When a man is צַדִּיק, declared in the right by God, and therefore righteous, one would expect



that, within this conventional phrase at least, δίκαιος (in the OT and in Matthew) could bear the unusual<sup>1</sup> meaning of "innocent".<sup>2</sup> There may, however, be other cases in which δίκαιος has this connotation. In Matthew's account of the trial of Jesus there are two events recorded which are without parallels in the Markan and Lucan versions. The wife of Pilate advises her husband, μήδὲν σοὶ καὶ τῷ δίκαιῳ ἐκείνῳ (Mt. 27:19): and Pilate himself, after washing his hands, says, ἄθῳός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου τούτου<sup>3</sup> (Mt. 27:24). While it would be unwise to claim that all suggestion of Jesus' moral goodness and saintliness is absent from the word δίκαιος here, nevertheless it is probable that the idea of innocence is important. Pilate's words occur in the trial context, and it is surely the task of judicial proceedings to declare culpability or innocence, rather than to assess the measure of a prisoner's goodness. We are obviously in touch with the Hebrew-based meaning of δίκαιος, "in the right", which, with special reference to Jesus, may be extended to connote innocence. his juridical innocence of human charges to be recognised. But this does not necessarily happen.

1 Neither LS nor Bauer list it as a possible meaning.

2 Gen. 20:5 (LXX) renders יְדֵי אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ χειρῶν. Again there is no positive righteousness associated with Abimelech's action: it is the idea of innocence which is expressed in the word δικαιοσύνη.

3 Nestle prefers the reading without τοῦ δικαίου, though the words are found in X.



Moreover, if the Sitz in Leben of these legendary additions to the trial narrative may serve as a pointer to the meaning of δίκαιος, it is plausible to suggest that it lies in an apologetic assertion of the early Church that the innocence of Jesus was recognised even by pagans, while the Jews were blind to it.<sup>1</sup>

A more interesting case is that presented by the words of the centurion at the Cross, in Luke 23:47: ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν, where both Matthew and Mark have υἱὸς θεοῦ. Why is this alteration made? What is the meaning of δίκαιος? Let us first assume, with some of the champions of the Proto-Luke hypothesis,<sup>2</sup> that the reason for Luke's substituting δίκαιος for υἱὸς θεοῦ is his use of his non-Markan Passion source. Now examination of Luke's Passion narrative<sup>3</sup> reveals a special desire to demonstrate the legal guiltlessness of Jesus. It is declared three times by Pilate (23:4,14,22), once by Herod (23:15) and by one of the dying thieves (23:41). All of these are without

1 Cf. TWNT, II, p.189: "Wenn das Weib des Pilatus Mt.27:19 Jesus als den δίκαιος bezeichnet, so mag wohl beides mitklingen: er ist unschuldig und im Sinne der Tugendaufassung ein Gerechter, wenn sie dies nicht als ἰουδαίου λέγουσα sagt, oder Mt. erzählend judaisiert. Dem entspricht Mt.27:24 ἄθωτος... im Munde des Pilatus."

2 E.g. V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, (Oxford, 1926) pp. 52-59.

3 This theme is taken into account by G.D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion story and Luke 23:47", JTS, XLIII, (1942) pp.34-36. With Kilpatrick's dismissal of the Proto-Luke hypothesis we are not concerned here.



parallels in Mark and Matthew, and consequently may be claimed to belong to the non-Markan source. If this is what Luke is following, then it would seem legitimate to suggest that δίκαιος in v.47 means "innocent".<sup>1</sup> If, on the other hand, we assume that Luke is deliberately altering the Markan reading, there must have been a reason for his doing so. Some suggest, on the basis of Wisdom 2:18 that the two terms are almost equivalent, υἱὸς θεοῦ being there used in the Biblical sense of "a faithful person loved by God" and δίκαιος of a person justified in God's sight and therefore righteous. But if that is how Luke understood the Markan phrase, why should he change υἱὸς θεοῦ at all, since δίκαιος (= "in the right") really lessens, rather than increases, the measure of acceptability with God suggested. If it is argued that Luke understood υἱὸς θεοῦ as akin to the Hellenistic θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, and feared the connotation which this would have among Gentiles, then we must still ask why he changed it to δίκαιος, a word which, if it means "morally upright", does nothing to clarify the right interpretation of υἱὸς θεοῦ; but rather weakens it. On the whole, it seems preferable to suggest that, if Luke was deliberately altering the Markan source, the use of δίκαιος with the meaning "innocent"

<sup>1</sup> The RSV so translates. Cf. TWNT, II, p.189: "Ebenso wird das Wort des Hauptmanns unter dem Kreuz Lk. 23:47 nicht anders als das des Herodes Mt.8:20... im landläufigen Sinn einen "Heiligen" meinen. Im ersten Falle ist damit auch "unschuldig" gemeint."



makes the change more significant and harmonises it with Luke's special theme. It may be permitted us to say, however, that we incline to the view that Luke was following a non-Markan source at this point, rather than altering Mark. Indeed, Mark may have originated the change.<sup>1</sup> What is of importance for our purpose is that, on either supposition, "innocent" (absolutely "in the right") is the most satisfactory rendering of δίκαιος .

B. δίκαιος etc. of those who wait for or prepare for the coming of the Christ.

According to Luke 1:6 the parents of John the Baptist were δίκαιοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμετέρου. There is no difficulty in interpreting δίκαιοι here: these are the faithful and obedient ones (cf. the "righteous" in the Psalms) who, by reason of their piety and devotion, are worthy to be the parents of the Forerunner.<sup>2</sup> A similar connotation is evident at v.17 where it is stated that the tasks of the Fore-runner will include, ἐπιστρέψαι... ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, i.e. "to return the rebellious to the wisdom of the righteous", whose righteousness consists in

<sup>1</sup> On the Lucan Passion narrative, see H. Schürmann, Quellenkritische Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk. xxi, 7-38 (Münster, 1953-58) and NTS, VI (1959-60) pp. 195-210.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G.W.H. Lampe, Luke (New Peake, p.824): "Here the narrative is moving wholly within the sphere of the piety of the old Covenant and the language is correspondingly Septuagintal".



obedience and preparedness for the fulfilment of the promises made to Israel. Of Simeon, Luke writes, ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ 2.:25. Whatever be the origin of the Lucan Infancy stories, it is not too much to claim that at least a part of the use to which Luke put them was to demonstrate that the signs of the fulfilment of Israel's hopes were manifested to and recognised by the pious Jews who were δίκαιοι, i.e. faithful to God and approved to him in spirit and life. In the same category we may place the description of Joseph of Arimathea, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος ... ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk.23:50). Matthew associates him with the disciples, but for Mark and Luke, the spirit of his hopes and the character of his devotion are sufficient to account for his deed of kindness.<sup>1</sup>

The Gospel of Matthew applies the term δίκαιος to one only of the forebears of Jesus. It says of Joseph, at 1:19, Ἰωσήφ δὲ... δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι ἐβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν. In the light of the context, which concerns the discovery of Mary's pregnancy before she had married Joseph, what sense does δίκαιος bear? Are we to understand it as suggesting Joseph's kindly and

<sup>1</sup> It might be argued that δίκαιος here connotes innocence of involvement in the death of Jesus, for it is followed by the statement "He was not associated with them (the Sanhedrin) in their plan and action": but this is an unlikely interpretation.



forgiving spirit in planning to send Mary away quietly, instead of exposing her to public shame, as he might have done (cf. Deut. 22:13ff.). This view is based on the (very doubtful) interpretation of δίκαιος (LXX 1 Sam. 24:17-18) as meaning "indulgent" or "forgiving". A second interpretation seems much more probable. Let us give equal value to the two descriptive phrases δίκαιος and μὴ θέλων, and let us realise that the intention of Joseph was "to put away Mary" whether λάθρα or publicly. In that he was δίκαιος, "in-the-right" with reference to the Deuteronomic code on matters of chastity: but the fact that he wished to do this λάθρα depend on μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι. Therefore in obeying the law which instructed him to put away his wife-to-be, Joseph was δίκαιος, but because of his desire not to expose her shame, he planned to send her away λάθρα.

Concerning the death of John the Baptist we read at Mark 6:20: ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον (while Matt. 14:5 puts it, ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον). The epithet ἅγιος is never used of men in Hellenistic texts, but in the LXX it is applied to Israelites and especially to priests who were consecrated to the service of God. This implies that δίκαιος here bears the meaning "pious", i.e. obedient to the will and the law of God, similar to the use of קִיָּא in the Psalms.



In the course of a Matthean passage which deals with the opposition of leading Jews to Jesus, we find this statement concerning John the Baptist: ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ Mt.21:32. A.H. McNeile interprets the phrase ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης as "with the path of righteousness", i.e. with the message of righteousness, and compares for this meaning of ὁδός Matt.22:16, Acts 16:17; 18:25.<sup>1</sup> This requires a very unusual sense for ἐν and it finds its only parallel (and a very doubtful one) in Biblical Greek at 1 Cor. 4:21, ἔρχεσθαι ἐν ῥάβδῳ. McNeile however does emphasise that the "righteousness" is that which John sought to exact from others and not his own personal righteousness in obedience and saintliness. W. Michaelis claims that this latter is the correct sense:

Johannes kam auf dem rechten Wege, dh. im Auftrage Gottes. Doch spricht der sonstige Sprachgebrauch bei Mt. dafür, dass δικαιοσύνη als "die dem Willen Gottes entsprechende Lebensgerechtigkeit" zu fassen ist. Auch dann ist aber wohl nicht an die Forderung eines solchen Lebenswandels gedacht, die der Täufer an seine Hörer gerichtet hätte. 2

Consideration of the wider context suggests that what Michaelis thinks unlikely is, in fact, the real meaning of the term here. The conditions for entry into the Kingdom clearly are (from the context) repentance and belief. These

1 The Gospel according to St. Matthew, (London, 1915). p.308.

2 TWNT. V, p.90.



were the demands of John's baptism, and the link between vs. 23-27 and vs. 28-32 is, in fact, the theme of John's baptism, its authority and its signs. This is corroborated by the parallel passage in Luke 7:29-30.: καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ

Now if there is an underlying reference to John's baptism in Matthew,<sup>1</sup> then δικαιοσύνη must refer to the righteousness which John demanded from those who heard his message, a righteousness which did not differ from that which Jesus desired of those who heard him.<sup>2</sup> It is a righteousness which begins with faith and repentance, and continues in a life in accordance with the divine will.<sup>3</sup>

Since we have been discussing John's baptism it would seem right to introduce here consideration of the words of Jesus in accepting that baptism: ἄφες ἄρτι· οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶ ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην Matt.3:15. Matthew alone introduces into the narrative of Jesus'

<sup>1</sup> E. Lohmeyer, Das Urchristentum: 1 Johannes der Täufer, (Göttingen, 1932) p. 103, n.1 claims that δικαιοσύνη is in fact "baptism" as the way to eschatological well-being.

<sup>2</sup> So also SB, I, p. 866ff, G. Schrenk, TWNT, II, p. 201 and G. Bornkamm, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (London, 1963) p. 28 note 1.

<sup>3</sup> This interpretation of δικαιοσύνη does not exclude its application to John himself: he embodied this righteousness, cf. G. Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit (Göttingen, 1962) p. 187.



baptism the dialogue with John, and its presence may reflect an attempt to solve the difficulty (in the mind of the early Church) concerning the suitability of Jesus' acceptance of water-baptism from his inferior.<sup>1</sup> Now it is clear from John's words, "I need to be baptised by you, and do you come to me?", that he recognises the personal superiority of Jesus: with that recognition given, it would have been sufficient for Jesus to have said (or to have been made to say), ἄφες ἔρτι ; but the evangelist goes on to indicate expressly the motive for his submission to John's baptism;

οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

Exegetes usually interpret this passage as meaning that Jesus either (a) acknowledges that "every divine ordinance" including baptism, must be observed,<sup>2</sup> or (b) recognises that baptism is his duty to the will of God and therefore must be carried out.<sup>3</sup> Concerning these views some points may be raised. (i) If δικαιοσύνη means "divine ordinance" it contradicts Matthean usage; why was δικαίωμα not used, a word which, elsewhere in the NT, means "ordinance" or "righteous act"?<sup>4</sup> (ii) While the verb πληροῦν can be used

1 The question of the relation between Jesus' sinlessness and his baptism exercised the minds of the early Christians. Cf. The Gospel of the Ebionites and The Gospel of the Hebrews, preserved in Epiphanius and Jerome respectively.

2 E.g. Loisy, Lagrange, Klostermann, Montefiore, McNeile.

3 E.g. Schrenk (op.cit.,) and A. Schlatter.

4 For the reiteration of this criticism and for the claim that such an understanding of δικαιοσύνη makes baptism a purely formal act, a ceremony which is fulfilled merely



in the sense of "conform to" or "fulfil (and thus obey) a command", it does not appear in Matthew with this meaning: it is always used by him to point to the completion or fulfilment of the Old Covenant in the new realities of the Kingdom. (iii) If δικαιοσύνη is used in the sense of πᾶν ὃ ἐν ᾧ δίκαιον (as in explanation 'b')) can it be claimed, with any justification, that in submitting to baptism by John Jesus obeyed all ( πᾶσαν ) the will of God? If not, οὕτως must be given a wider connotation to mean "in ways like this": that is to say, accepting baptism is an example of the attitude of faithfulness to the divine will which he will always show. On this interpretation of οὕτως( and with πρέπον ἐστι including a future reference) the view that Jesus is here fulfilling all duty to God can be defended, but the strange character of the expression invites further investigation.

Recently Oscar Cullmann has suggested<sup>1</sup> that, in submitting to John's baptism, Jesus was undertaking the role of the Suffering Servant who takes upon himself the sin of his people. Others came to be baptised for their own sins, but Jesus was baptised for the sins of all others in the baptism of his death, of which there is anticipatory because it is commanded, see G. Barth, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, p. 138.

1 Baptism in the New Testament, (ET, London, 1950). pp.18-19.



notice in this phrase. Therefore<sup>234</sup>, for Cullman, πληρῶσαι  
 πάντων δικαιοσύνην means "to effect or acquire righteous-  
 ness for all", an echo of Is.42:1, "He will bring forth  
 justice ( ὑψῆς / κρίσις ) to the nations". In spite of the  
 possibility that Is.42:1 may lie behind v.17 ("in whom I  
 am well pleased") is this not a forced interpretation of  
 this peculiarly Matthean expression? It is unusual and non-  
 Matthean for πληροῦν to mean "effect, acquire, win", and  
 πάντων δικαιοσύνην meaning "righteousness for all" is a  
 Pauline form of expression. Cullmann's exegesis seems to  
 be dominated by the Suffering Servant motif and to disregard  
 completely Matthean usage. Is there another interpretation  
 of the phrase more consonant with Matthew's use of πληρόω  
 and δικαιοσύνη . It has been suggested above that the state-  
 ment "John came ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης " connotes the demands  
 of righteousness placed on John's hearers both in and sub-  
 sequent to baptism, the righteousness of life in accordance  
 with the will of God and therefore in obedience to his law-  
 the law which, according to Matt.5:17 Jesus came πληρῶσαι  
 i.e. to realise and to establish as the will of God. With  
 this in mind, it seems natural to interpret the phrase under  
 discussion in the following way: by submitting ( οὕτως )  
 to John's baptism (which was, for John's hearers the way  
 of entry into a life of renewal in obedience to God's laws)  
 Jesus acknowledges the validity (for himself and others) of



the total demand of righteousness in accordance with the law: John understood and proclaimed the righteousness which is truly the will of God and both Jesus and He ( ἡμῖν ) must establish it, must realise it as a complete ( πᾶσαν . ) righteousness of spirit, obedience and life. In other words, Jesus aligns himself with John's understanding of the meaning of true righteousness, the righteousness of the Kingdom: in being baptised he takes upon himself the demand of this righteousness, thus humbly yet powerfully establishing its authority. It seems that to interpret δικαιοσύνη in some such way as this is consonant with Matthew's special use of the word.<sup>1</sup> To that we now turn.

#### C. δικαιοσύνη in Matthew.

The term δικαιοσύνη appears five times in the Sermon on the Mount. Of these the first is in the Beatitude, μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται (5:6). Probably Luke has preserved the more original form of the Beatitude, referring to the physical hunger

<sup>1</sup> G. Strecker, op.cit., p.179. considers that the passage comes from a redactor and that δικαιοσύνη means no more than "right conduct" as it should be carried out by disciples. G. Barth, op.cit., pp.140-41, suggests that πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην refers to the whole will of God which Jesus fulfils in that he, as the Messiah-Judge of the world, humbles himself and enters into the ranks of sinners, acts for sinners (cf. G. Bornkamm, TBlät XVII, 1938, pp.44ff.) K. Stendahl (New Peake, p.773) speaks of Jesus fulfilling "the plan of God, which, in Matthew, has righteousness as its ultimate goal". These two views may be incorporated in the total theological meaning of the passage, but they stand at some distance from its actual language.



of the poor: "Blessed are ye that hunger, for ye shall be filled". In Israel the "poor" constituted not only a social class, but also a religious type (Luke 1:53; 6:20): they were the poor saints of God who lived a life of simple piety and to whom the Kingdom belongs because they are of it (Luke 6:20).<sup>1</sup> As in the first Beatitude, here again Matthew expands the Lucan form in the interests of clarification: the spiritual character of the hunger is stressed. The righteousness after which the poor seek is the doing of God's will and the obeying of God's law: these things are the very goal and purpose of righteous living. Δικαιοσύνη is more than "goodness": it is the righteousness of obedience which God desires and approves. It seems that the common interpretation of δικαιοσύνη here as "divine (eschatological) salvation", "the vindicating righteousness of God in action" is not correct.<sup>2</sup> This interpretation derives

<sup>1</sup> T.W. Manson, Sayings of Jesus (London, 1949) p.47 points out that at Ps.Sol.10:7 "the saints" and "the poor" stand in synonymous parallelism. This use goes back to the Seleucid rule in Palestine when the poor remained faithful to their religion and the Law. "The Kingdom of God belongs to these simple devoted souls, because they belong to it, having accepted God's will as the only rule of their lives. As they submit themselves to the obligations of the Kingdom, so they become heirs of its privileges".

<sup>2</sup> G. Schrenk (Righteousness, p.35) also suggests that there is no need to think of the judging and saving righteousness of God, in a forensic eschatological sense. G. Barth (op.cit. pp. 123-24) appears, at first, to want to hold together the two meanings: they long "that God will pronounce upon them in the judgment the verdict 'righteous': they long for the rightness of disposition which is acceptable to God". Yet, in a note, he criticises Schrenk's view that δ. is rightness of disposition, because (he says) it is said that the



from Isaiah (LXX), but in Matthew δικαιοσύνη never bears this meaning:<sup>1</sup> moreover, the gospels do not suggest that the saving action of God comes as a response to human desire, however intense: the attitude of fear and vigilance is more often enjoined upon man as his proper disposition. Those who interpret δικαιοσύνη of the divine activity or righteous verdict at 5:6, do not insist on that meaning at 5:10: μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, a beatitude for which there is no definite Lucan parallel. It occurs in the 3rd person plural (and general) Beatitudes of Matthew, before the transition (v.11) to the 2nd person plural, "Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you". Since the theme common to the two beatitudes is persecution, it is likely that the future persecution of "you" (i.e. disciples) should be regarded as part of, or at least in line with, the past and continuing (δεδιωγμένοι) general persecution ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης. Those who have been, and righteousness is bestowed, and therefore cannot mean anything else but that God pronounces them righteous in the judgment. But is this necessarily the case? Surely the true righteousness of disposition through obedience leads to divine gift also (Is.56:1, Prov.21:21). This is, in fact, what G. Strecker (op.cit., p.157) claims. He reviews both interpretations of the word, but decides for human righteousness. The desire for this righteousness is not passive waiting, but active obedience: and its full realisation is the gift of God. (pp. 157-58.)

1 Strecker, op.cit., p.156 "Jedoch wäre dieses Verständnis von δικαιοσύνη im Zusammenhang singular, so dass der Gedanke der menschlichen Gerechtigkeit wahrscheinlicher auch hier im Vordergrund steht."



still are, persecuted for righteousness' sake must refer to the saints who were down-trodden and despised because of their faithfulness to the will and law of God, with perhaps an echo of the ancient prophets and martyrs who suffered persecution for their obedience (cf. v.12).<sup>1</sup> The meaning of δικαιοσύνη here is not otherwise than at 5:6, viz. the true righteousness of obedience to the word and will of God, a righteousness which brought upon those who sought to possess it rejection and persecution.

The next occurrence of δικαιοσύνη is at v.20 in the same chapter, "I tell you, unless your righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." The context is important for the interpretation of the word here. Jesus claims that his purpose is "to fulfil the law and the prophets"<sup>2</sup> not to destroy them, and he goes on to say,

Whoever relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

If the disciples are to enter that kingdom, their "righteousness" must exceed that of the scribes. In this context δικαιοσύνη must bear the same meaning as elsewhere in the chapter: it is the righteousness of obedience, carrying out

<sup>1</sup> On this possibility, see E. Stendahl, Matthew (New Peake's Commentary) p. 775-6.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. to bring to actualisation, to establish as the will of God. Cf. G. Barth, op.cit., p.69.



the will of God as expressed in the law - that law which Jesus is truly establishing, whereas it had been perverted through casuistry by the scribes and Pharisees.<sup>1</sup> We come now to Matt.6:1 - προσέχετε δε τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς. It is well-known that in later Hebrew, both Biblical and Rabbinical, נָחַם could mean "benevolence" and was translated by ἐλεημοσύνη (e.g. Dan.4:27). Therefore it is sometimes suggested that δικαιοσύνη in 6:1 is synonymous with ἐλεημοσύνη in v.2, both being derived from the one Hebrew term and both meaning "almsgiving" or "benevolence".<sup>2</sup> This would be an unusual use of δικαιοσύνη in the Sermon on the Mount and in Matthew's gospel as a whole: it would also make "alms" in v.2 almost redundant. It seems preferable to regard v.1 as an introductory statement to what follows on the danger of hypocrisy in almsgiving, prayer and fasting<sup>3</sup> (note the three occurrences of ὅταν in vs. 2,5,16.) Ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην will then mean something like "to practise piety" and δικαιοσύνη will refer, as elsewhere, to that righteousness of life which corresponds to the will of God and of which the observances of sincere devotion are part.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The special-M tradition here may have originated in a Judeo-Christian, anti-Pharisaic milieu.

<sup>2</sup> So C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p.46, n.1.

<sup>3</sup> So Schrenk, op.cit., p.36 and G. Barth, op.cit., p.139.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Bornkamm, op.cit., p.30 calls it "the all-embracing notion for the piety of the disciples as a whole".



The last occurrence of the word in Matthew is at 6:33 - ζητεῖτε δε πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (where Luke has τὴν βασιλείαν alone). Luke probably understands by βασιλεία the Kingdom under its eschatological aspect: but for Matthew the βασιλεία is not the purely eschatological kingdom, but the kingdom as a present possibility in those who believe and acknowledge the sovereignty of God<sup>1</sup> and he cannot think of the kingdom without also thinking of the righteousness which obtains in it (αὐτοῦ). The presence of δικαιοσύνη in our text suggests that admission to the kingdom really depends on seeking to fulfil that righteousness: the word therefore denotes "rightness of life" before God, conduct in agreement with his will, at the heart of which lies the disposition of obedience and devotion.<sup>2</sup> This is the righteousness which will bring the disciples wholly under the sway of the kingship of God.

From the preceding discussion we can see that there is consistency in the Matthean usage of δικαιοσύνη. It refers to uprightness of life, behaviour that is pleasing to God and in obedience to his will and law. The single instance of the noun in Luke (1:75) is not otherwise. The Benedictus conforms completely to and expresses, in the

<sup>1</sup> Only if βασιλεία was purely eschatological would δικ. refer to the "righteousness" of God in saving activity.

<sup>2</sup> Only if interpreted in this way will 6:33 harmonise with the whole attitude of Matthew's gospel.



emotional language of liturgy, the hope of the Old Covenant (both nationalistic and spiritual), ". . . that we, being delivered from the hand of our enemies, might serve him (λατρεύω) without fear, ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν . The association of the two words, ὁσιότης and δικαιοσύνη is suggestive of the Greek distinction between moral and religious virtue,<sup>1</sup> but that distinction will scarcely hold here. In the OT(LXX) λατρεύω means "to serve God" both in worship and in life, including the observance of the divine demands. This is its meaning in Luke. Those who thus serve God are characterised by ὁσιότης and δικαιοσύνη, the latter meaning that "righteousness" of obedience which seeks to fulfil God's will. This sense of the word is not unexpected in a hymn which is so full of the thought and language of pious Judaism as is the Benedictus. Having thus found a consistent use of δικαιοσύνη to refer to active obedience to the will and law of God, we must now turn to the occurrences of δίκαιος in the Synoptics to see if they corroborate this finding.

#### D. Δίκαιος and δικαιοῦς in the Synoptic Gospels.

Some of the occurrences of δίκαιος we have already dealt with as meaning "innocent". We may note in passing that at Matt.20:4,7 and Luke 12:57 the neuter adjective ( δίκαιον )

<sup>1</sup> The word ὁσιότης is not common in Biblical Greek, being found only four times in the OT and five times in Wisdom.



or noun ( τὸ δίκαιον ) bears the meaning "that which is fair and just" in a legal sense.<sup>1</sup> At Matt.5:45 the Father in heaven is described as one who τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροῦς καὶ ἀγαθοῦς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἁδίκους . The context of this affirmation is the exhortation to the disciples to pray for those who persecute them: their attitude should not be vindictive but benevolent, for thus shall they be the children of their Father who does not discriminate in giving his gifts. The point is not that God is indifferent to moral worth, but that his impartiality is due to his merciful kindness. The traditional Jewish distinction is upheld here, viz. that between the righteous or upright in God's sight and the unrighteous; but the orthodox idea that, by virtue of their superiority, the righteous have privileges over sinners is absent. Those who are regarded as ἁδίκαι should be treated with mercy and patience by men, as by God.

A more significant case of δίκαιος appears at Mark 2:17 (Matt.9:13, Luke 5:32): οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς (Luke adds εἰς μετάνοιαν ). With most commentators we interpret καλέσαι of the call to the Kingdom or to repentance, rather than of the invitation of a host.<sup>2</sup> Many exegetes regard this saying as an ironical statement

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aristotle NE.5. 1129a.

<sup>2</sup> Controversy in the early church regarding table-fellowship may have led to the preservation of the saying and may have influenced the narrative.



-243-

of Jesus and interpret the δίκαιοι as those who think they are righteous, but who, in fact, are not.<sup>1</sup> It seems that the chief consideration on which this view is based is that of context. The utterance of Jesus comes at the end of a narrative in which the scribes and Pharisees (or the scribes of the Pharisees) have apparently challenged the friendship of Jesus with sinners and publicans, this being but one of a series of such clashes in the relevant chapter of each evangelist. It is assumed then that Jesus is hinting at the insincerity of their claims to righteousness. But is this the most likely interpretation of the saying? We may observe that (i) by giving this meaning to δίκαιοι, the parallelism with the preceding "proverbial" utterance is lost: οἱ ἰσχύοντες means "those who are well", not "those who think they are well". (ii) we do not find in the Gospels any other occasion on which δίκαιοι by itself is used in an ironical sense; we do have φαίνεσθαι δίκαιοι (Mt. 23:28) ὑποκρίνεσθαι δίκαιοι εἶναι (Luke 20:20) and οἱ πεποιθότες ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι (Luk. 18:9). Consequently, some commentators regard (rightly, it seems) the utterance as having a straightforward meaning.<sup>2</sup> Jesus does not call the

<sup>1</sup> E.g. E. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, (2nd ed. Tübingen, 1926), McNeile, op.cit., Hoskyns and Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament (London, 1947) and V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London, 1952) p.207.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Loisy, Lagrange, and Schlatter. Stendahl, Matthew (in New Peake) p.782 does not exclude the possibility that "Jesus recognises his opponents as in some sense acceptable to God, only pleading for a place also for the despised".



righteous, because he considers them to be really such, and therefore not needing repentance. The δίκαιοι are those who truly live or seek to live in accordance with God's law and will: they are not the object of his mission.

"The ordinary standards are recognised and the zeal of the 'righteous' is acknowledged".<sup>1</sup> This view preserves the parallelism of the two utterances and is consistent with the Gospel usage. Moreover, it is strengthened when we refer to Luke 15:7 (which echoes the language of the verse just discussed) "There is joy in heaven over one sinner repenting more than over ninety-nine just persons (δίκαιοι) who do not need repentance". Without allegorising the parable, we may say that the ninety-nine still belong to the flock: they did not go astray: there is no suggestion of irony: they are the faithful and obedient to the demands of God. The love of God seeks the one who has wandered. Now this parable was put forth by Jesus, like the utterance we have been discussing, as an answer to the challenge of the scribes and Pharisees to Jesus' friendship with sinners. This creates a strong possibility that δίκαιοι should be understood in the same straightforward sense in both places. If, however, we interpret δίκαιοι at Mark 2:17 and parallels, to mean the "zealously righteous", how are we to answer the argument based on the context? It should be remembered that Mark 2:

<sup>1</sup> Schrenk, op.cit., p.22.



13-17 is an Apothegm or pronouncement-story. The emphasis and importance lies with the utterance of Jesus: the narrative serves as framework, and it may be that the anti-Pharisaic tendency on the part of the evangelist<sup>1</sup> has left its mark on this story, with result that it should not be allowed to influence too strongly the interpretation of the dominical saying.<sup>2</sup> It would seem that, if we take the utterance by itself (as an original logion, or at least as being true to the spirit of Jesus), then the word δίκαιοι will bear the usual sense of the faithful and obedient ones of Israel: the saying may be rooted in some demonstration of Jesus' concern for publicans and outcasts. If, on the other hand, we integrate the saying closely with the controversy-narrative as it now stands, then it is possible that δίκαιοι may have an ironical connotation.<sup>3</sup> This is one occasion in which a saying of Jesus may have had its meaning altered in the use made of it by an evangelist.

In the course of the Matthean account of the invective against the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus criticises them thus (23:28): ὑμεῖς ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῖς

<sup>1</sup> This tendency in the Gospels reflects the later controversy between Church and synagogue; not all the Pharisees were unscrupulous and hypocritical, and indeed probably few were.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. if we regard 17b as original, and not, with Bultmann and Dibelius, as a doctrinal expansion.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew's redactional addition ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν may suggest that this is how Matt. meant the word to be interpreted, if the quotation implies criticism of Israel's religion.



ἀνθρώποις δίκαιοι, ἔσωθεν δέ ἐστε μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας . Consistently with Matthean thought, the last part of the verse suggests that sincerity and obedience to the law are the marks of the righteous: these qualities the Pharisees lack, although they wish to be regarded as having them. Again, the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican at prayer is directed πρὸς τινὰς τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσιν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενούντας τοὺς λοιπούς (Luke 18:9). The words πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς should be taken literally. They do not mean "considered themselves to be righteous", but "believed in themselves" or "relied on themselves" (cf. Luke 11:22; 2 Cor. 1:9): consequently ὅτι should be rendered as "because" rather than "that". The achievements in piety and morality on the part of the scribes ministered to their self-esteem rather than to a humble trust in God, and caused them utterly to despise those who did not acknowledge their standard or who failed to live up to it. The publican, the sinner by any standard, κατέβη... δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκείνου . What is the meaning of "justified" here? Does it refer to forgiveness or, as Schrenk suggests, to judicial absolution, as in Paul, but without the reference to the Cross?<sup>1</sup> The latter is closer to the right understanding. The attitude of the publican before God comprises confession of sin and

<sup>1</sup> Schrenk, op.cit., p. 60.



appealing trust in God's mercy. This is the attitude which is alone acceptable to God: those who possess it are "in the right" with him: those who do not possess it, however good their record may be, are not justified, are not accepted as righteous.<sup>2</sup>

Once more in a context concerning condemnation of the Pharisees, Luke puts the following words on the lips of Jesus: "You are those who justify themselves (οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ) before men, but God knows your hearts; for what is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God". (16:15) This saying of Jesus is only very artificially connected with what precedes it on the topic of the love of wealth: the saying is concerned with pride, rather than with wealth, and the Pharisees, in any case, were not specially lovers of wealth. T.W. Manson makes the attractive suggestion<sup>3</sup> that if the Sadducees were the object of the criticism, it would fit better with the wider context, and would give a word-play within the saying: "You are the people who, by taking the name 'Sadducee' (connected

<sup>1</sup> We may recall the quality of the piety of the Psalms (Psalmenfrömmigkeit) and of the Qumran Hodayot - a humble trust in God's forgiveness and mercy as the only source of acceptance. With these expressions of faith, this parable is in some measure an anticipation of the essential spirit of the Pauline doctrine of justification. Cf. T.W. Manson, On Paul and John (London, 1963) p.55 "This parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is the connecting link between Jesus and Paul in the matter of Justification."

<sup>2</sup> κατ' ἐκείνους is used in an exclusive sense, like Heb. כִּי

<sup>3</sup> The Sayings of Jesus, p.295.



with sdq) make public claim to be the party of righteousness"; but God looks deeper and sees that the name does not possess the reality within. It is the failure to possess real righteousness through obedience and humility that is criticised: they merely made themselves out to be righteous and expected others to pass a favourable verdict on their conduct. Likewise, at Luke 10:29, the young lawyer (after receiving Jesus' answer to his question about eternal life) wishes to "justify himself (δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν ) and asks, "And who is my neighbour?" The Hithpael of פָּטַל is translated at Gen.44:16 by the middle of δικαιόω meaning "to make oneself out to be in the right" or "to clear oneself of a charge". It is possible that the active voice with the reflexive pronoun here (and at 16:15) bears the same connotation. The young lawyer wants to vindicate his manner of life, to put himself in the right for not having done his obvious duty, and so he asks "Who is my neighbour?". A less significant example of δίκαιος may be treated here. The introduction to the story about the paying of tribute-money records that the authors of the question about its legality were spies, ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δίκαιους εἶναι (Luke 20:20). Matthew and Mark claim that they were Pharisees (or disciples of the Pharisees) and Herodians. The meaning is obvious: their pretence was to uprightness and sincerity, with perhaps a suggestion of their scrupulous, but hypo-



critical, concern to obey the standards of Judaism. These "negative" examples of the use of δίκαιος etc. do not suggest any other standard of "righteousness" than that of sincerity and obedience to the law of God, as expressing the divine will - the very heart and substance of Israel's faith and religion.

# E. δίκαιος etc. in eschatological contexts.

We come now to those occasions on which the words we are discussing appear in eschatological contexts. The verb is used once only in this type of material. "I say unto you, that every idle word (ῥῆμα) that men shall speak, they shall give an account of it in the day of judgment, ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ Mt.12:37. The change from ῥῆμα to λόγος and the unexpected use of the 2nd singular suggest that the verse comes from a different context. It is probably a proverbial quotation. That does not mean, however, that the eschatological reference does not belong to the saying, for SB has drawn attention to Rabbinical evidence for the belief that the record of a man, as kept in heaven, included his words, even his harmless utterances, as well as his acts.<sup>1</sup> The saying seems to point to the belief that the words of men are at least part of the basis on which final acceptance with God, final justification, is adjudged.

<sup>1</sup> SB, I, p.639f.



In the interpretation of the Parable of the Tares we meet this statement: "Then will the righteous (οἱ δίκαιοι) shine like the sun in the kingdom of their father". (Matt. 13:43) Now it seems clear from the context that the δίκαιοι here are the direct opposite of πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν, whom the angels cast into the lake of fire. These two expressions depend on LXX Zeph. 1:3 (to which the parable and its interpretation, as a whole, owe their inspiration) and are equivalent to מ'גשגש ת'ג ת'גשגש. The first of these two words should probably be interpreted as "stumbling-blocks" or "causes of offence" for which σκάνδαλα would be a satisfactory equivalent, and the "evil ones (מ'גשגש) appear as οἱ ποιοῦντες τὴν ἀνομίαν.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the δίκαιοι, being contrasted with all such, will be those who are not stumbling-blocks and who obediently served God and kept the law. The verse may reflect LXX Dan. 12:3 which promises that, in the Resurrection, the οἱ συνιέντες<sup>2</sup> (LXX and Theod.<sup>3</sup>) ἐκλάμψουσι (Theod.) ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης τοῦ στερέωματος. These words seem, on the basis of Dan.11:33,35 to refer to teachers and martyred teachers. Is there, then, in the Lucan verse a hint of the function

<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew, as it stands, is difficult to construe meaningfully.

<sup>2</sup> οἱ συνιέντες represents מ'גשגש. Is there an underlying word-play in the original tradition between מ'גשגש (Aram. מ'גשגש) = δίκαιοι and מ'גשגש (Aram. מ'גשגש) = σκάνδαλα?

<sup>3</sup> In Theod. δίκαιοι appears of the מ'גשגש מ'גשגש.



and fate of the disciples? This is no more than a speculation. At v.49 of the same chapter the angels have charge of separating τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων . The eschatological ideas are the same: οἱ δίκαιοι are those who are acceptable to God by life and service. If the Sits in Leben of the parable in the teaching ministry of Christ is the vexed question of who belongs to the kingdom of God, the meaning of δίκαιοι is not altered.

In the Matthean parable of the Last Judgment we find the δίκαιοι (Matt.25:37) raising the question of their service, and at v.46 entering into "eternal life". Whether or not πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (v.32) means "all people" or "all Gentiles", it is clear that the δίκαιοι among them are those who performed the service of kindness to others, (i.e. either to the brethren of Christ generally, or to the disciples as united with Jesus in the solidarity of the "Son of Man"). Kindness to the poor and suffering finds wide recognition in Jewish writings as a means of meriting salvation.<sup>1</sup> The δίκαιοι are those who have included this virtue in their obedience to the will and commands of God. The distinction between ἁδίκαι or πονήροι and δίκαιοι is one of the themes of the eschatological narratives: the various scenes give characterisations of the two classes.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ned.40a. The best Rabbinic thought placed "performance of kindnesses" on a higher level than mere almsgiving, cf. Sukk. 49b; Aboth 1.2, "On three things the world stands: on Torah, the worship and the performance of kindnesses".



F. δίκαιος in association with "prophet" and "martyr". Four occurrences of δίκαιος in this type of context are found in Matthew. In speaking of the privilege of disciples in knowing the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, Jesus adds (Matt.13:17) "Many prophets and righteous men (πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ) longed to see what you see, and did not see it; and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it." Luke's version of the saying has πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς. In view of the fact that "righteousness" is a leading theme in Matthew's gospel, it is suggested by many that he has altered the Lucan version. But Luke has the logion in a rather different context, and elsewhere links the Psalms of which king David was regarded as author with the prophets, 24:44. Δίκαιοι suits the Matthean context and so may well be more original here. Who are these δίκαιοι ? Although the collocation "prophets/righteous" does not appear in the OT, we may be certain that they are the "saints" of Biblical history, who remained faithful in their time to the law and to God, and who desired the fulfilment of the kingdom. Whether a semi-definite class is referred to here we shall see as we discuss the other passages.

In one of the Woes on the Pharisees, in which they are accused of possessing the same spirit as their forefathers who slew the prophets, it is claimed that they hypocritically οἰκοδομεῖν τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ κοσμεῖν



τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν δικαίων (Matt.23:29). They do this to make amends for their ancestors' misdeeds, but they are just as ready to persecute anyone who challenges insincerity. It seems certain that we have here more than a reference to the "saintly": the δίκαιοι are those who were "pious", but who were persecuted, even to the death, because of their stand for righteousness. They are, in fact, the martyrs of the OT - and probably those of the Maccabean period as well - from Abel (ὁ δίκαιος v.35) to Zechariah, i.e. from the beginning of the OT canon to its end:<sup>1</sup> their αἷμα δίκαιον ("Innocent blood") was poured out on the earth and will be visited on those who continue to contribute to the cup of Israel's iniquity. Abel and his successors are the "saints", the godly of Israel, but more specifically, those who sealed their testimony of obedience and faithfulness with their life's blood.

Before we look at the last occasion on which προφήτης and δίκαιος are associated, it would seem worthwhile to investigate another point in the Woe we have been discussing. The words of Jesus (Matt.23:34: in Luke 11:49 the words are attributed to "the wisdom of God") bear a forward-looking reference: ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς. The fate of the emissaries quite clearly resembles that of the disciples (10:17,23) and Luke I He is probably the martyr Zechariah of 2 Chron. 24:20-22.



actually says that those sent are "prophets and apostles". Consequently we may claim that the language has been coloured by the experience of the early Church, and the list of emissaries may reflect contemporary conditions in the Jewish-Christian community. From this point of view, it is possible that we have here a reference to two activities within the Christian mission, that of preaching (κήρυγμα) and that of teaching (διδάχῃ), the former being suggested by προφήται and the latter by σοφοί and more particularly by γραμματεῖς, the usual word for "scribes" in the NT. Matthew may have in mind the order of διδάσκαλοι in the church, who were no less unpopular with orthodox Judaism than those who "proclaimed" the Gospel. In connection with this suggestion that the γραμματεῖς here are the "teachers" in the Judeo-Christian community,<sup>1</sup> one recalls Matthew's statement at 13:52 (M): "Therefore every γραμματεὺς who has been made a disciple of,<sup>2</sup> or who has been instructed in (μαθητευθεὶς) the kingdom of heaven is like a man who is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old". Is it too much to suggest that the Christian "scribe" is a teacher bringing forth out of the treasure of Israel's faith and scripture the old truths

<sup>1</sup> That they are Christian officials or teachers is accepted by G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, (Oxford, 1948) pp.110ff, 126. and Strecker, op.cit., pp.37-8.

<sup>2</sup> The γραμματεὺς at 8:19 seems to be a disciple, for v.21 speaks of ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν.



and their new meanings in the light of the kingdom?

Bearing in mind then the possibility that prophets and teachers are mentioned together (reflecting the situation of the early church) we turn to Matt.10:41. At the conclusion of the Mission-charge to the disciples, Jesus declares:

He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me (Q). He that receiveth a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man ( δίκαιος ) in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward (M).

In the context of a mission charge, it may be that Matthew is suggesting the distinction of preaching and teaching functions. Can we suggest that δίκαιος may be an archaic term for "teacher" (διδάσκαλος )? It would give greater sense to the passage. The person who receives a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive the reward of hearing the proclamation of God's message: he that receiveth a righteous man (teacher?) in the name of a righteous man will receive the reward of being instructed in the understanding of the message.<sup>1</sup> This is put forward merely as a suggestion. If the δίκαιοι may be thought of as "teachers", then προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι (13:17) may include an oblique reference to the order of those who followed (both logically

I It is doubtful if "to receive a prophet's or a righteous man's reward" means "to be accounted or rewarded as if one were a prophet or righteous man". A genitive originis seems to be a better explanation.



and temporally) the prophets in the post-exilic period, i.e. the scribes or teachers of the law. Did not they also, when faithful, seek to see the kingdom? But perhaps this is too much to build on the tentative suggestion made above.

G. An unusual use of the verb δικαιώω.

We conclude this discussion by making reference to the unusual use of the verb δικαιώω in a verse already mentioned, (Luke 7:29):

When they heard this all the people and the tax-collectors justified God (ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν) having been baptised with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the purpose of God for themselves, not having been baptised by him.

It is clear from the antithetic form of the saying that ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν must be approximately opposite to "rejected the purpose of God". Is there any usage in Biblical Greek which would make this possible? We have pointed out earlier in this work that the Psalms of Solomon never use δικαιώω for "to justify (man)" but only for "to recognise the justice of God" (Ps.Sol.2:16,3:5, 4:9,8:7,27). This is also a common meaning of hiddiq or qiddaq in Rabbinic writings.<sup>1</sup> Thus δικαιώω here may most suitably mean "to recognise and acknowledge the righteousness of God".<sup>2</sup> In submitting to the conditions of baptism,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bab. Ber. 19a, Sifre Deut. 307 on 32:4, and Sif. Lev. on 10:3.

<sup>2</sup> So also Lampe, Luke (New Peake) p.831.



the people acknowledged that God's judgment on them, expressed in John's preaching, was a just judgment. A similar sense may be applied to the verb in the enigmatic saying at Matt. 11:19: καὶ ἐδικαίωθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς, which Luke renders by ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (7:35). Whether ἡ σοφία is Jesus himself, or the wisdom of God of which he is the manifestation, the context requires the saying to mean that this wisdom is recognised as righteous, i.e. proved to be in the right and accepted by God, by reason of the things it does, particularly in seeking sinners. Luke changes the wording probably to suggest, on the basis of v.29, that the action of "wisdom" is acknowledged as right by all her children, her true children, meaning by these the publicans and sinners who "justified" God by accepting John's baptism.<sup>1</sup>

From the preceding discussion it is clear that the meaning of δίκαιος and related words in the Synoptic Gospels must be interpreted within the framework of thought of the Old Testament, the witness to Israel's religious faith. "Righteous" and "righteousness" stand squarely within the faith of Judaism, at its purest and highest, as a religion of obedience and devotion to the will of God. The content of the terms owes much to the use and meaning of the δίκαιος -words in the Septuagint.

<sup>1</sup> A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus, (Stuttgart, 1957) p.374-5, interprets the verb in Mt. 11:19 as "condemn". This is a Hellenistic use and is not found in the NT.



Part 2. Paul.

We have now completed the necessary preliminaries to an investigation of the meaning of δικαιοσύνη etc. in Paul's writings. We have become familiar with the varied use of the term נָפֶטֶל and related words in the OT and the frequency of their translation in the LXX by δικαιοσύνη : we have reviewed the use and meaning of the word in Classical Greek and drawn attention to the points of similarity and contrast between secular Greek usage and that of Biblical Greek and of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. We then traced the use of the root נָפֶטֶל in the Qumran scrolls, paying attention to the anticipations of Pauline doctrine contained there. We sketched briefly the development of the meaning of נָפֶטֶל and associated ideas in Rabbinic thought. Finally, we surveyed the use of the δίκαιος -words in the Synoptic Gospels and discovered that their meaning consistently reflects the OT and Jewish understanding of "righteousness" as trust in the power and mercy of God and obedience to the Law as the expression of the divine will. Now we turn to Paul, bringing with us the fruits of our background study in an effort to find out where the roots of his use of δικαιοσύνη lie. How far does the OT idea of נָפֶטֶל and particularly the LXX usage explain his usage? To what extent are the expressions of the evangelical piety of the Qumran community the clue to his understanding of "righteousness"?



How far, if at all, has he introduced new elements, whether from secular Greek thought and usage or through his own Christian conceptions? By keeping the mind open to this possibility we avoid the error of claiming, as E. Hatch did, that a word uniformly used in the LXX as the translation of a Hebrew word "must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word".<sup>1</sup> This is sometimes, indeed often, the case, but by no means necessarily so. For one thing, considerations of context must be given their rightful place in the interpretation of meaning: and, secondly, with reference to the  $\pi\rho\tau\varsigma$  -  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  complex, we must remember that the Hebrew word itself reveals considerable variety of meaning (as our study of its semantic change has made clear) and this has to be reckoned with even in its uniform translation by  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ .<sup>2</sup>

Our brief survey of the Rabbinic teaching on righteousness and related themes will have demonstrated to the reader the intensity of the desire, on the part of the individual Israelite, to win, both in life and especially at the final judgment, the approbation of God. The path to this end was obedience to the precepts of the Torah, the inclusive expression of the whole Jewish religion. Within

<sup>1</sup> Essays in Biblical Greek, (Oxford, 1889) p.35.

<sup>2</sup> This must not be done by adding together the significances of  $\pi\rho\tau\varsigma$  and then attributing them all to  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ . J. Barr, Semantics, p.144ff has warned against this procedure.



Judaism, the Law defined the demands of the Covenant and was therefore the test of Israel's faithfulness to the Covenant. According to an ancient midrash, the Israelite who broke the Law violated the Covenant between the community of which he was a member and God. On the other hand, by faithfully observing the precepts of the law, the Israelite renewed, as it were, the Covenant and accomplished in himself Israel's mission to and for mankind. Now the role of the Covenant and the Torah was not confined to certain moments of life: it covered its whole extent. Therefore it was logical "to multiply the prescriptions so as to enclose the whole life of the individual, the family, the community, the whole people, in a network of observances, in order to make every moment, every action, a fulfilment of the Law, a mitzvah, and thus to consecrate, as it should be, the whole life of Israel and the Israelite, from birth to death."<sup>1</sup> These prescriptions, operative in the spheres of worship and of morality,<sup>2</sup> had been drawn from the written Torah, from the oral Torah, i.e. the living and authentic tradition of God's people, and, thirdly, from the halachic tradition which found in the Torah, and in other sources of tradition, practical interpretations and obligatory

<sup>1</sup> P. Demann, The Jewish Faith, p.71.

<sup>2</sup> Between these two spheres there is no clearly drawn frontier. In each it is a matter of carrying out the will of God. To a people dedicated to the service of God, worship concerns morals and morals relate to worship.



rules of conduct, believed to go back to Moses and Sinai, and deriving thence their authority and binding force. This legal activity could easily lead to a rigorous spirit or to a casuistry of the opposite tendency, although in the Rabbinical literature itself both these deviations were severely criticised. As we have pointed out, the doctrine of kawannah or religious intention played an important part in all Jewish spirituality,<sup>1</sup> and tradition always set before the Israelite the highest and most disinterested motives for his actions and observances, viz. the fulfilling of the Law for its own sake, because it is God's will, and faithfulness to the engagement accepted by Israel at the inauguration of the Covenant.<sup>2</sup> Besides this quest for a pure and disinterested fidelity, Rabbinic tradition was familiar with the idea of merit ( מידות ) defined by Démann as "simply the accomplished mitzvah which endures and, while it hastens the coming of the Kingdom, also purifies and sanctifies the one who has performed it, and constitutes a ground of reward in him."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Chapter X of the Rabbinic Anthology (Montefiore and Loewe) pp. 272ff., also T.W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospels, pp. 39ff.

<sup>2</sup> "The precepts of the Law must be carried out in order to attain the purpose of Israel's election, which is to hallow the Name, to glorify God and bear witness to him before the world, to hasten the coming of the kingdom of God...", P. Démann, op.cit., pp. 72-73.

<sup>3</sup> Démann, op.cit., p.73. Notice that the doctrine of righteousness and the teaching on merits is almost exclusively related to the Judgment and the eschatological era.



We may fairly claim that the directions of thought outlined here formed part of Paul's inheritance as a Jew, within the main-stream of Pharisaic Judaism. Yet in his Epistle to the Galatians<sup>1</sup> there is set forth a doctrinal position which amounts to a fundamental rethinking and re-statement of the conception of "righteousness". The attitude of Peter at Antioch on the question of eating with Gentiles led Paul to accuse him in public of inconsistency. His report of his words on that occasion merges into an exposition of the Gospel, 2:15ff. ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί, εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ. In these verses we have the middle/passive of δικαιόω used three times (a fourth appears in the next verse), the third being in a quotation from LXX Ps.143(2):2. In our study of LXX usage we had occasion to comment on the use of the middle and passive of the verb to render the Qal of רָץ and meaning "to appear righteous, to be in the right, even to be righteous", and one of the examples cited was Ps. 143:2. Some interpreters of Paul have emphasised this oft-neglected meaning of δικαιόσθαι, but they have suggested (some-

<sup>1</sup> For arguments which make Galatians the earliest letter, see G.S. Duncan, Galatians, (MNTC, London, 1934) pp. xxiiff. Most scholars date it closer to the Corinthian and Roman letters.



-263-

times implicitly, sometimes explicitly) that this rendering "to be righteous" demands a revision of the current understanding of Paul, since "to be righteous" is a qualitative term. The error of this view lies in its last mentioned assumption. The Qal of  $\text{פָּלַח}$  rendered by the middle and passive of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  and translated as "to be righteous" is not qualitative, but retains its forensic significance. The "righteousness" is a matter of being "in the right" before God, i.e. at the divine tribunal, not of being righteous in oneself. Therefore, whether we render the word  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\text{-}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  as "be in the right, be righteous" or, more conventionally, as "to be justified", the word has forensic significance. Righteousness here is a status rather than a character or content of life.<sup>1</sup> In opposition to Jewish teaching, Paul asserts that the declaration of "righteousness" is not based on a man's achievement of obedience to the Law, but on his trust in Christ.

Now if there is implicit in the verb the idea of judicial pronouncement, we must ask the question: when, in the Pauline scheme, does the pronouncement take place? According to Jewish teaching, and particularly the Rabbinic teaching, the judicial act was postponed to the Last Judgment: then, and perhaps only then, would a man be pronounced righteous on the basis of his keeping the Law and his merit

1 That  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{o}\nu\eta$  and cognate words are used also of the character of the Christian life will be seen later.



achieved. The use of the future tense at Gal. 2:16 and Rom. 3:20 would be taken by the Jews as pointing to this future judgment. Did Paul understand it in that way? The use of the future tense here is not decisive, since it falls within a quotation, and other strands of the Apostle's teaching imply that the judicial act belongs to the time of this life. What is a matter of hope for the Jew is, for Paul, a present possibility and reality. When a man is united by faith to Christ in his death and new life, when he is thus found in Him who is adjudged supremely "The Righteous One" in God's sight, then he too is declared "in the right" and set within the sphere of God's righteousness. The declaration of the believer's "in the rightness" or "righteousness" is the primary consequence of his being in Christ. On that relationship all else depends. Paul, of course, continued to associate justification with the Last Judgment when the final consummation of the believer's acquittal takes place. To that aspect of his thought we will return.

Among the passages which witness to Paul's derivation of "righteousness" or "justification" from the idea of "being in Christ" we may cite: (1) Gal. 2:17 - εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ i.e. "if, while seeking to be justified (be righteous) in Christ...", ἐν Χριστῷ being the sphere within which, as it were, the declaration of righteousness takes place: (ii) 2 Cor. 5:21, "Him who knew



no sin he made to be sin for us ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ". Paul will not say that God made Christ to be sinful or a sinner, but uses the noun ἁμαρτία a "sin" (probably with the LXX meaning "sin-offering"): for the sake of parallelism in construction he uses the noun δικαιοσύνη to describe believers, but what he means is that through identification with Christ (in his death and resurrection) we are given the status of "being in the right before God". Once more, "in Christ" is the sphere of our justification. (iii) Rom. 6:6-7 "We know that our old self was crucified with Him so that the sinful body might be destroyed and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. For he who has died is freed from sin (δεδικαιώται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας )".<sup>1</sup> The death of Christ brings "justification" from sin, and the believer who dies with Christ, appropriates for himself the "justification" or "Atonement" achieved by the death of the Righteous One (or Righteous Martyr<sup>2</sup>). The real point of his argument", says Schrenk, "is conformity, through faith, with Christ's death, which holds the secret of justification".<sup>3</sup> (iv) The idea is again set forth in Phil.

<sup>1</sup> The last sentence is a Rabbinic cliché (e.g. Sif. Num. 112 on 15:31) associated with the doctrine of Atonement through martyrdom: see K.G. Kuhn, ZNW, XXX (1931) pp. 305ff. This parallel may reveal how "justification" and "atonement" are brought together.

<sup>2</sup> R. Scroggs, NTS, X, (1963) pp. 104ff. has stressed the idea of the atoning value of the righteous martyr's death in explanation of this verse.

<sup>3</sup> Schrenk, op.cit., p. 65. Cf. C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (London, 1957) p. 125.



3:8-9: "All this I count as dross in order that I may win Christ and be found in him μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, that I may know him and the power of his resurrection...." In these verses, according to Schrenk, "the juridical is combined with the mystical".<sup>1</sup> Paul describes his present attitude ( ἡγοῦμαι ) and continuing ideals: to be found in Christ, not possessing the relative righteousness which may be attained when the Law is the standard, but that which comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness proceeding from God and accorded to faith. In view of the ethical content suggested in the first δικαιοσύνη, many commentators feel obliged to understand the second occurrence in the same way. On the contrary, the second δικαιοσύνη should be interpreted as "the status of being in the right", of being acceptable to God, and that because it comes "from God and in response to Faith".<sup>2</sup> Now this "righteousness" or "justified status" is related to, if not actually dependent on Paul's being "found in Christ". Notice, however, that this is not a purely eschatological hope of "justification".

<sup>1</sup> Schrenk, op.cit., p.51.

<sup>2</sup> Of this righteousness which proceeds from God and is according to faith, F.W. Beare writes: "It is not a higher kind of moral attainment, but is basically a right relationship with God, which God himself creates through Christ, and opens freely to all who believe in Christ. It is always and only the gift of God and not in any degree the achievement of man." (Epistle to the Philippians, London, 1959, p.120).



By reason of his faith, Paul already possesses this "righteousness" through being in Christ: his aim is to retain the status in ever-deepening relationship to Christ, till the union finds its consummation in the final kingdom. There are two other passages in Galatians where δικαιοσύνη may be related to the idea of union with Christ, namely 2:21 and 3:21. The former follows the classical statement of the theme of identification ("I am crucified with Christ: it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me") and reads, εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν . The order of the verses suggests that faith in the atoning death, which means "dying and rising with Christ", brings a man into the status of "righteousness" before God. At 3:21 we read, εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὥτως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη . "Righteousness" is here related to "being made alive". No law was given which could effect this, but the verb ζωοποιῆσαι may be a hint at the process of dying and rising (into new life) with Christ by faith. This union does make alive and puts men "in the right" with God.

The association of δικαιοσύνη and "union with Christ" seems to be confirmed by the relationship which Paul affirms (both in the contexts surrounding these verses in Gal. and elsewhere) between Christ's death (and, by implication, the believer's identification with it) and freedom



from condemnation under the law. At Gal. 2:19, he says, "I, through the Law, died to the law, that I might live to God." How the necessity of abandoning the Law (conceived of as a legalistic system, not as centralised and summed up in love, Rom. 13:8, 10; Gal. 5:14, nor as the will of God made known to men, Rom. 2:13) was made evident to Paul By law, he does not here state, but it is probable that the explanation lies in the kind of experience under the law described in Rom.7. There Paul tells how the law had taught him his own inability to meet its requirements and also its own inability to make him righteous, thus leading him finally to abandon it and seek salvation in Christ. It is of significance that in Gal.2 Paul speaks of this abandonment as "dying to law" and then goes on, as if to explain this, by referring to "crucifixion with Christ" and entering new life through this death. This is elucidated by Gal.3:10ff. Inability to fulfil the demands of the law brings man under a curse, for Scripture has said "Cursed (ἐπικατάρατος) be everyone who does not abide by all the things written in the book of the law to do them" (Deut. 27:26; Gal.3:10). Freedom from the oppression of this curse can be attained only through death: "the law is binding on a person only during his life" (Rom.7:1) is a principle well known in Rabbinic teaching (bab.Shab. 30a, 151b). By his death Jesus not only broke the tyranny of the law, but also identified himself



with man's plight by becoming himself ἐπικατάρατος , by virtue of the method of his execution (Deut. 21:23, Gal.3:13). It follows then that those who are united with him in this death are also freed from the law.

So, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ. ... Now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we serve, not under the old written code, but in the new life of the Spirit. Rom. 7: 4,6.

This union with Christ in his death is sealed and symbolised by baptism and is the entry into a new status and into a new life of freedom and power.

We were buried with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life. (Rom.6:4, cf. 8:11).

This risen life with Christ is lived, not under the reign of law (for its power has been broken through our identification with Christ in his death), but under grace "which reigns through righteousness to eternal life" (Rom.5:21). Thus with the possibility of new life there is given the possibility of righteousness before God as the character of that life.<sup>1</sup>

Now it may be objected at this point that Paul does not generally state that "righteousness" or "justifi-

<sup>1</sup> In order to bring this sketch of one aspect of Paul's thought to its conclusion, we have been led to anticipate the second main sense of "righteousness" in the Apostle's writing, the "righteousness" which characterises the life of the Christian. This will be taken up at a later stage in our discussion.



cation" depends upon "being in Christ", but declares that the status was obtained through faith (Phil.3:9, Rom.3:28 4:5 etc). But what does "faith" mean for Paul? It is not an intellectual assent to dogmatic statements, but "a joyful self-committal of the whole personality to God",<sup>1</sup> which is the origin of an intensely personal relation with Christ. "Faith" always implies, for Paul, its object, Christ, and connotes relationship with him. In fact, as Gal. 2:20 shows, it is faith which is the pre-condition and basis of Paul's dying and rising into new life with Christ, of his "being in Christ".<sup>2</sup> In the words of G. Schrenk, "Faith is the means whereby the individual is drawn into participation in the consequences of the saving event".<sup>3</sup> Our understanding of Paul's message is seriously weakened, if not distorted, unless we give to "faith" its full significance in the expression "justification by faith".<sup>4</sup> When the word "faith" is understood as "a being united with Christ" in his death

<sup>1</sup> C.A.A. Scott, Christianity according to St. Paul, (Cambridge 1927) p.133.

<sup>2</sup> This is not to deny the social connotation of the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ, but the fellowship of the Christian with Christ is an important aspect of Paul's thought. Cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp.86-87.

<sup>3</sup> op.cit., p.46.

<sup>4</sup> We must guard against the error of turning "faith" into a Christian virtue (or good work) or of making it a part of the process of justification. See on this T.W. Manson, On Paul and John, p.63.



and new life, with all that that means in terms of surrender and sacrifice, then it is indeed the source of our acceptability with God, the means of justification and righteousness. Any lesser idea of "faith" is in danger of making "justification by faith" a semi-magical process without theological depth. It may be that to make the doctrine a part of the wider Pauline theme of union with Christ is to give it a secondary position within Paul's theological system. But may that not, in fact, be its proper place? It is not the essential pivot of his theology. The centre of his thought lies in the twin conceptions of "dying and rising with Christ" and of undergoing a New Exodus in him and of so being incorporated into a new Israel, the community of the Spirit. This is not to deny the truth of "justification by faith" nor its tremendous significance in Christian theology, but is simply to put the doctrine in the place where it may be seen in true perspective in its relation to Pauline teaching as a whole.<sup>1</sup>

The use of the phrase "righteousness by faith" in Paul (rather than statements indicating its logical derivation from the "in Christ" theme) possibly originated in its being required in those OT passages which he cites in support of the doctrine. In his controversy with those who insisted on the centrality of the Torah - legalistically

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W.D. Davies, op.cit., pp. 222-223.



interpreted - and the necessity for universal obedience to it, Paul had to find support for his position. The only kind of support that would carry conviction to his opponents was scriptural, and so he appealed to two passages, Gen. 15:6 and Hab. 2:4, and argued from them that faith, rather than works of obedience to the Law, was, according to Scripture itself, the means of salvation. Both these verses are used in Galatians and require some discussion. Gal. 3:6 - Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην : therefore it is men of faith (and that may include Gentiles also, vs. 8-9) who are the sons of Abraham and inherit the blessing.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that Paul has in mind here an argument available to or used by his opponents to the effect that it was clear from Gen. 12 and 17:10-14 that no-one could participate in the blessings of God's covenant with Abraham and so in the Messianic salvation (which is inseparably associated with it) unless he was circumcised, i.e. was fulfilling the obligations of the law. Paul's quotation, however, is meant to show that before there was any mention of circumcision, Abraham's faith was the means of his pleasing God and inheriting the blessing. What is meant here by δικαιοσύνη ? The quotation is the LXX rendering

1 From the Jewish point of view the faith of Abraham was not faith in Paul's sense, but an act of fidelity and therefore a good work, acquiring merit, cf. 1 Mac. 2:51. But Judaism has no place for the rigid distinction between faith and works: faith can only fully exist when it is embodied in works.



of וְהָאֵמֶן בִּיהוָה וַיַּחֲשֹׁבֶה לוֹ צְדָקָה where צְדָקָה clearly means an act of trust and obedience which is "right", "as it should be", and, as such, approved by God. The Targumic rendering of the verse is interesting - וַיַּחֲשֹׁבֶה לֵיהּ לְצִדְקָה (Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan) - and reveals clearly that the act of fidelity was understood as a source of merit.<sup>1</sup> Now Paul cannot mean by δικαιοσύνη "merit", but there is nothing in the word itself, nor in λογίζεται εἰς which can be claimed as deciding between (i) "it was attributed to him as right conduct", i.e. he was regarded as having acted righteously, in the right way, and (ii) "it was reckoned to him as a ground of acceptance with God". If a strong recollection of the Hebrew צְדָקָה is uppermost, we should probably decide for the former, but that would not altogether exclude the second, since the "right action" was the type of conduct or attitude of mind which God desires and which is pleasing to him. It would appear that Paul is filling the word (which he conveniently found in Gen.) with his own special content, drawing it into his vocabulary of "justification" and thus stressing its forensic aspect. The emphasis is, however, not laid on the word δικαιοσύνη in the verse: the operative term is "faith".

<sup>1</sup> Rabbinic sources also magnify the faith of Abraham. R. Shemaiah (1st cent. B.C.) claimed that "Abraham received possession of this world and the world to come by the merit of Faith", quoting Gen. 15:6 (Mekh. Ex. 14:31. There were other views too, but in Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism A. remained the great pattern and symbol of faith or fidelity to God.



The second of the OT passages used by Paul is Hab. 2:4 and introduced at Gal.3:11 - ὅτι δε ἐν νομῷ οὐδεὶς δικαιούται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δηλον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται "no one is in the right or righteous before God on the basis of law, for (it is written) 'He who is righteous by faith shall live'" There seems to be no doubt that this is how the Hab. verse must be rendered here: the sequence of thought and argument demands it, although it contradicts the Hebrew and the LXX rendering. The Hebrew text has "The righteous man ( צַדִּיק ) will live by his faithfulness",<sup>1</sup> and the LXX "The righteous will live by my faithfulness (ἐκ πίστεως μου)". Paul understands πίστις as "faith" and not "faithfulness" and links it with ὁ δίκαιος to get the meaning he requires.<sup>2</sup> ὁ δίκαιος is the "righteous man", the man who is in the right before God and therefore acceptable to him: he possesses the status ἐκ πίστεως, and such a man ζήσεται : those who are of the works of the law stand under the curse, 3.10.

1 The interpretation of the verse in the Habakkuk peshar from Qumran (8.1) has been already discussed. p.209f.

2 Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, (ET, London 1931) p.208. G.S. Duncan, op.cit., p.94-95 interprets thus and adds, "It must be remembered that for him (Paul) the true meaning of any passage was to be found, not within the narrow limits of its historical context, but in its relation to the eternal truths of divine revelation". The use made by Paul of δικαιούσιν and πίστις in a different sense from that originally meant in the quotations raises an interesting semantic problem. It may be said, however, that collections of OT quotations probably had been formed with the purpose of facilitating discussion with the Jews and demonstrating the truth of Christianity. Paul may have used some of these, and this would explain his method of quoting and interpreting Scripture to prove a point.



Before turning to the Epistle to the Romans we may comment on some passages from the Corinthian correspondence. 1 Cor. 1:30 - ἐξ αὐτοῦ (God) δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις, ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. Here again δικαιοσύνη is brought into association with the death of Christ and life in him, for the context makes it clear that it is supremely in the Cross that God has revealed that true wisdom which cannot be attained by philosophical enquiry, a wisdom which is composed of righteousness, sanctification and redemption.<sup>1</sup> It seems probable that these terms refer to three aspects of "deliverance in Christ", and therefore δικαιοσύνη is best interpreted (as in Galatians) as "justification", the status of being in the right before God, achieved for man by Christ in his death and possessed by those who are in Christ.<sup>2</sup> The forensic connotation of δικαιοσύνη is undoubtedly present in 2 Cor. 3:9 where it is contrasted with κατακρίσις, "condemnation": "If there was glory in the dispensation of condemnation (i.e. in the Mosaic law) then the dispensation of justification (i.e. which pronounces righteous) abounds

<sup>1</sup> To treat "righteousness, sanctification and redemption" as explanatory of "wisdom" seems the most satisfactory procedure, see W.D. Davies, op.cit., p.154.

<sup>2</sup> So Schrenk, op.cit., p.43 and C.S.C. Williams, 1 Corinthians (New Peake p.955). Even if the terms are interpreted of the stages of progress in Christian living, our view of the meaning of δικαιοσύνη need not be altered.



far more in glory" - a statement which Paul makes part of the comparison between the Exodus of the Old Israel and the New Exodus in Christ. We may add here a note on 1 Cor. 6:11, "You were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified (ἐδικαιώθητε) in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God". It seems likely that the three verbs refer to three aspects of the significance of baptism "in the name of Christ". The believer was washed, and sanctified, i.e. separated to a life of holiness, and he was declared "righteous" before God. Some commentators regard this occurrence of the verb δικαιῶ as meaning "made righteous"; that is to say, they interpret it as referring to the character of the Christian life. This seems doubtful, for Paul does not appear to use the verb at any time in this sense. By "justification", i.e. by undergoing that union with Christ in his death and resurrection which was symbolised and sealed in baptism, the Corinthian believers were put right with God: that, of course, was the initial step in a process of becoming or being made righteous, the beginning of a salvation-process to be consummated at the End.

When we turn to the Epistle to the Romans the first appearance of the verb δικαιῶ occurs, somewhat surprisingly perhaps, in the statement - οὐ γὰρ οὐ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ (τῷ) θεῷ, ἀλλὰ οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται.



2:13. The context makes it clear that Paul, respecting the obligations of the Law for Jews, is claiming that the Jews will be judged by that law, and that the test will be, not knowledge of its provisions, but obedience to them. Complete conformity to God's will as expressed in the Torah may, in theory at any rate, put a man in a right relation with God. By obedience, the Jew may be justified: but, in actual fact, this merit of obedience does not exist, for not one of them renders this total obedience. Their failure to keep the commands, however, does not release God from the obligations to keep his promises. He remains faithful to his Covenant, even when Israel defaults, and Ps. 51:6 proves it: ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε, "that thou mayest be in the right (the Gal of ρ7X referring to the victorious litigant) in thy words," Rom. 3:4. But this (Paul continues) does not mean that ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν, that "man's wickedness demonstrates more clearly the righteousness of God" i.e. his fidelity and rightness in judging, for then the wrath of God against the sinner would be unjust. All men, Jews and Greeks alike, are under the power of sin and lacking in righteousness, but, since law brings the knowledge of sin, obviously "no one δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Ps. 143:2) ἐξ ἔργων νόμου". As in Gal. 2:16 this quotation has a forensic reference and means "no one is in the right before



God, no one can be justified, on the basis of works of law". The law which demands righteousness cannot create it. There is only one remedy - the Gospel.

The great passage which follows, 3:21ff, will be taken up at a later stage in our discussion. The theme of the superiority of faith to works is resumed in 3:27 and continues through chapter 4. There is no room for boasting, for the self-confidence which claims its duty done: λογίζομεθα γὰρ δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (3:28). Faith is the sole means of becoming accepted, of being in the right before God, and Scripture itself illustrates this in the case of Abraham. If he was justified on the basis of works, then he had grounds for boasting: but, in fact, he had no such grounds, for it was faith which was counted to Abraham as righteousness ( Ἀβ. ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην ), Rom. 4:3. The content of the terms πίστις and δικαιοσύνη here comes from Paul's own theological standpoint, rather than from the Hebrew words translated by them in the LXX. The argument goes on: "To one who does not work, but trusts him who justifies ( τὸν δικαιούντα ) the ungodly ( τὸν ἄσεβῆ ), his faith is reckoned as righteousness. So also David pronounces a blessing upon the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works: 'Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sin is covered: blessed is the



man whose sin the Lord will not count" (4:5-8). The v.5 presupposes the conclusion already arrived at: faith and the performance of works are opposed to each other as the basis of justification, and Abraham is among those who simply trust in God. This faith "is counted as righteousness", which means that God justifies the man who has it, pronouncing over him the verdict of approval. The three words δικαιοῦνται τὸν ἀσεβῆ are a striking allusion to the OT, describing God as doing what the OT forbids, Ex. 23:7, Prov. 17:15, Is. 5:23. These passages indicate that δικαίω possesses its forensic connotation, "to justify", to give the status of being in the right, and they show that Paul is declaring a great paradox in the divine action. The NEB rendering "him who acquits the guilty" seems to overstate the paradox, and F.W. Beare is right in questioning the accuracy of the translation at this point.<sup>1</sup> "To acquit the guilty" seems to go further than the literal sense "justify the impious" permits,<sup>2</sup> especially since the quotation from Ps. 32:1 makes it clear that δικαιοῦν here is tantamount to "to forgive".<sup>3</sup> The "counting of righteousness" becomes equi-

I NTS, VIII, (1961-62) p.91, in a review of the NEB.

2 "For Paul, in all cases where man is concerned, the meaning 'acquit' is excluded. For 'acquit' means to pronounce guiltless or innocent: and it is of the very essence of Paul's argument that no man is guiltless before God", T.W. Manson, On Paul and John, p.54.

3 W.A. Stevens made much of this for his understanding of "justification", AJT, 1, (1897) pp.443-50. Cf. also C.K. Barrett, op.cit., p.89 and F.J. Leenhardt, Epistle to the Romans, (ET, London, 1961) p.116.



valent to the "not-counting of sin". And is "to forgive" the same action as "to acquit", even though the result be the same? Verses 11ff declare that Abraham's circumcision did not confer righteousness on him and was not a token that he was henceforth under obligation to keep the law in order to be justified: it confirmed by a visible sign the fact that he had been justified by faith. Likewise the promise of Gen.22:17ff, though made after Abraham had been circumcised, was not therefore dependent on his observing the law, but rather διὰ ("through" or "in the context of", sic Barrett) δικαιοσύνης πίστεως, that is, "the righteousness (or justification) which comes by faith". Very noticeable here is the use Paul makes of the word δικαιοσύνη. He takes it from the LXX of Gen.15:6, but puts upon it a meaning that is not the same, or is an extension of that which it held in its original context.<sup>1</sup> In this he would appear to be applying Rabbinical exegetical methods which tolerated the practice of interpreting words without reference to their contextual meaning.<sup>2</sup>

In the fifth chapter of Romans "justification" is again associated with faith and with the death of Christ.

1 Cf. J.H. Ropes, JBL, XXII (1903) p.225, "The term in these passages goes in ... as moral excellence; it comes out, after Paul has used it, with his peculiar stamp upon it."

2 We have seen this in Mek.Beshallah, 4, see p.<sup>218</sup>. Cf. Paul's use of the principle gezerah shawa' in Rom. 4, on which see Barrett, op.cit., p.89. The principle states that when the same word occurs in two Biblical passages, each may be used to illuminate the other.



Since we are justified by faith (δικαιωθέντες ἐκ πίστεως) we have peace with God.... Since we are justified in his blood (δικαιωθέντες ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ), much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God. (5:1, 9).

Two conclusions are thus drawn from the fact of justification: we have peace, now; and, in the future, we shall be saved. The justification, the setting of us right with God, has been effected (lit.) "in his blood". The ἐν may be instrumental ("by means of") or, reflecting a Hebrew idiom, may mean "at the cost of",<sup>1</sup> but, in either case, the sacrificial and atoning death of Christ is declared to be the means of the present justification, which itself guarantees deliverance at the final judgment. Where the Epistle to the Galatians developed the doctrine of "righteousness" before God without directly mentioning forgiveness and the atoning death of Christ, Romans clearly associates justification with the atoning sacrifice. In both epistles, however, the idea of identification with Christ is implicit. Whoever, in faith, (and it is possible only in faith) applies the atoning sacrifice of Christ to himself (as having taken place for him along with others) is included among those for whom it was offered: consequently, he has a part in the forgiveness which has been thus obtained and which is the "favourable verdict" involved in justification.<sup>2</sup> The Adam-

<sup>1</sup> This is Barrett's suggestion (op.cit., p.107) and stresses the sacrificial reference in "blood".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Schweitzer, op.cit., p.218.



Christ typology affirms the character of this verdict. τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα (5:16), "Judgment, proceeding from one act of transgression, led to condemnation, but the gift of grace, following on many trespasses, leads to justification". The word δικαίωμα requires different translations elsewhere (1:32, 2:26, 5:18, 8:4) but in using it here Paul may be governed by rhetorical considerations:<sup>1</sup> it rhymes with κατάκριμα. There is no doubt, however, that he means "justification" or even "acquittal", the opposite of "condemnation". The use of the same word in v.18, with the meaning "a righteous act" is probably again dictated by the stylistic necessity of finding a word to rhyme with παράπτωμα ("act of transgression"). When δικαίωμα is employed with this sense, it can no longer be used (in the same sentence) to mean "justification": consequently Paul chooses for this purpose the word δικαίωσις which he uses elsewhere only at 4:25.<sup>2</sup> The words εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς are important. They refer back to v.17, "those who receive τὴν περισσειαν...

<sup>1</sup> Leenhardt, op.cit. p.147 speaks of "a studied effect of alliteration."

<sup>2</sup> "Christ was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν". It seems best to translate διὰ prospectively, "with a view to..". According to v.17 A's. justification is the result of faith in God who quickeneth the dead. We need not make fine distinctions as to what is achieved by Christ's death and what by his Resurrection. The two events are inseparable in the NT. The Crucified is what he is only because he was raised, and Paul can say that we are justified by his death and that he was raised for our justification.



τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης.. ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύουσιν διὰ τοῦ  
ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . Now "the gift of righteousness" ma

mean the conferment of righteousness upon man, or the gift which proceeds from God's righteousness. In either case, the gift is the means by which man can share in the blessing of victorious living, that eternal life which is his already in germ. In a more cautious fashion, v.21 asserts the same view. "Because grace reigns, righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) becomes possible and righteousness leads to eternal life".

Δικαιοσύνη here includes both the forgiveness of sins, which is the means of initial acceptance with God, and the righteousness of life (following justification) which progresses towards eternal life. The meaning of this verse confirms the likelihood that ζωῆς (in εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς v.17) should be understood eschatologically, as well as of the Christian life. "For Paul, justification looks forward to the perfecting through which alone it receives its ideal and its final manifestation".<sup>1</sup> This theme is also suggested by v.19 "through the obedience of one, δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί ". The words are both logical and eschatological: they refer to succeeding generations of believers as well as to the final acquittal at the Last Judgment. At Rom. 8:33 δικαιοῦν probably refers to God's declaring a person righteous at the Judgment; as it does in Gal. 5:5, ἡμεῖς γὰρ  
I Schrenk, op.cit., p.73.



πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. On the latter verse, G.S. Duncan comments, "Though the believer is 'accepted as righteous' here and now he relies on Christ to complete the good work that has been begun in him and to 'make him righteous' so that he can be accepted on the day of judgment."<sup>1</sup>

We now come to the second main use of δικαιοσύνη, but before we engage on that discussion there is an important matter to be investigated. Often in the course of our discussion of δικαιοσύνη we have used the phrase "being in the right before God", an explanation dependent on the meaning of the Hebrew נָפְתָל . What exactly does that phrase mean? In what does the "in-the-rightness" consist? We have mentioned the fact that E.J. Goodspeed defends the rendering "to make righteous" as the interpretation of δικαίω .<sup>2</sup> In so far as this implies a qualitative righteousness, righteousness of character, we have suggested that it is an incorrect interpretation of the Hebrew word. Others have explained the word as "to declare to be righteous" a person who, in fact, is not righteous - a sort of fictitious righteousness. Bultmann claims that the justified man is actually made righteous, but it is a forensic righteousness: he has righteousness in the verdict of the law-court.<sup>3</sup> C.H.

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.156

<sup>2</sup> JBL, LXXIII, (1954) p.87f.

<sup>3</sup> Theology of the New Testament, I, (London, 1952) p.272. The section pp.270-85 is a most valuable discussion of the term.



Dodd puts the emphasis on vindication, but speaks also of the righteousness of the forgiven or converted man;<sup>1</sup> while, long ago, J.H. Ropes suggested that in Paul's thought the sinner is vindicated as against the sin which wrongly oppresses him; as against this sin, which is his accuser in court, his is the righteous cause.<sup>2</sup> This last interpretation may be true of the statement of the doctrine of justification by faith in Romans, where it is brought into association with the atonement and forgiveness, but it will scarcely hold for Galatians. Realising that the act of justification (expressed with the Hebrew פָּטָח in the foreground of thought) creates a status rather than a character, Bultmann rightly insists on the idea of an actual but forensic righteousness, not a quality but a relationship based on the forgiveness of sins and the experience of dying and rising with Christ by faith. This divine verdict, however, must have consequences for ethical conduct (as Dodd and Bultmann fully realise), as the justified man seeks, through obedience to the will of God and the "law of Christ", to become a "righteous" man.<sup>3</sup>

We turn now to this use of δικαιοσύνη to characterise the life of the Christian man between the time of 1 Epistle to the Romans (MNTC, London, 1932) pp.12ff, and 51-5.

2 JBL, XXII, (1903) pp.211-227.

3 Cf. T.W. Manson, On Paul and John, p.64, "There is no such thing in Hebrew or Christian thought as a salvation which does not take immediate effect in the creation of a new moral achievement here and now."



his acceptance on the basis of faith and his final acquittal at the last Judgment. This application of the word-complex agrees with the classical Greek use of δικαιοσύνη to describe man's moral life. It will be remembered, however, that in our discussion of the difference between the Biblical Greek and Classical Greek usages of the word we pointed out that, while the idea of conformity to a norm is present to both, the norm itself is very different. In Greek thought the norm was regarded as being the citizen's duty to the state or community: in Hebrew thinking the norm was conceived of as being the will of God within the Covenant community. While Paul is not unaware of the social side of a Christian's life and his responsibilities as a citizen, these are brought within the framework of God's will for his whole life within the new community.<sup>1</sup> Ethical standards have their source in the will of God and the "law of Christ". Obedience must be the character of Christian living, and for Paul obedience could never be opposed to faith, but followed on faith. It is possible to make too much of the contrast between Pauline Christianity as a religion of liberty and Judaism as a religion of obedience. To do so is to forget (i) the importance for Paul of the ethical teaching of Jesus

<sup>1</sup> Within the Pauline doctrine of "justification" the covenant relationship (i.e. New Covenant in Christ) is assumed, though δικαιοσύνη is not directly associated with the word διαθήκη. P.J. Achtemeier, (IDB, IV, p.91ff) makes the concept of the covenant (broken, restored, accepted) basic to his entire explanation of δικαιοσύνη in the NT.



and the demand to attempt to conform to the character of Christ, and (ii) that the doctrine of "justification by faith", if isolated and regarded as the essential pivot of Paul's thought, can lead to antinomianism, a danger of which the Apostle himself was well aware. We do disservice to him and his thought if we do not view the doctrine in its proper perspective and its proper context, which is, the union of the believer, by and in faith, with Christ in his death and new life. To die with Christ is to be free from subservience to the Law. Faith alone makes possible or creates this relationship of identification within which a man is accepted by God. The life to follow must be the "new life" in Christ, lived in the power and freedom of the Spirit; but it is also a life of discipline, obedience and of righteousness well-pleasing to God. This meaning of δικαιοσύνη is found in Rom.6 where Paul counsels the Roman Christians both to offer their members to God as ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης (v.13) and to be slaves of obedience εἰς δικαιοσύνην (vs. 16.18) which will lead to sanctification. Here the translation "justification" would be entirely out of place: what is meant is "righteousness of life", which is to be the aim of those who, by faith, are accepted by God and who must, through the power of the Spirit, enter the service of righteousness. This life of faith, though a life of freedom from observances, is a life under the rule of God. "For the kingdom of God is not



eating and drinking, but righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), peace and joy in the Holy Spirit", Rom. 14:17. It is true that "righteousness" and "peace" usually describe the objective relation with God, but "joy" here is certainly subjective and probably determines the sense of the other two words. "Righteousness" must therefore be "righteous living" (which springs, from the objective relation of "righteousness") and "peace" will mean a peaceful state of mind and affairs (and that too arises only from a relation of peace with God). At 2 Cor. 6:7 Paul commends the character of his ministry and life by listing virtues he has shown, and he adds, διὰ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν : this may be a comprehensive description of the qualities mentioned as the instruments and armour of ethical uprightness.<sup>1</sup> At 6:14, δικαιοσύνη is contrasted with ἀνομία : "righteousness" and pagan "iniquity" have nothing in common any more than have light and darkness or Christ and the prince of demons; in other words, the Christian life bears the stamp of uprightness as opposed to pagan vice.

In Phil. 1:11 Paul expresses the hope that, in view of the day of Christ, the Philippian Christians may be pure and blameless, πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ ". Is the word δικαιοσύνης a genitive of origin or of quality? Most com-  
I Cf. the claim of false apostles at 11:15.



mentators take it as the latter. Paul desires that the Philippians should be embodiments of "righteousness". F.W. Beare argues that δικαιοσύνη is the fruit springing from justification :

The thought is not that righteousness is itself the harvest, but that it is the right relationship with God which produces the harvest. The Christian character developed in all its clearness and purity is the end product of the grace by which we were 'justified'. <sup>1</sup>

While no one would wish to deny the truth of this statement, it seems that it reads too much into Paul's words at this point. The idea is true to Pauline theology, but it is doubtful if it is expressed here. <sup>2</sup>

In the ethical or hortatory section of Ephesians, <sup>3</sup> Paul outlines contrasting ways of living. "Put off your old nature which belongs to your former way of life and is corrupt through deceitful works.... put on the new nature, τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας , 4.22-24. The Christian man is formed after the image of God - a new man - in righteousness and holiness which are "of the truth" in contrast to the deceitfulness and corruption of their former life. The contrast is continued (now between light and darkness) and 5:9 demands, 1 F.W. Beare, op.cit., on 1:11.

2 The understanding that "righteousness" as fruit comes, not naturally, but only through Christ and from a relation to him, is always implicit in Paul.

3 It is assumed that Eph., if not written by Paul, contains Pauline thought. At 2 Tim. 3:16 δικαιοσύνη means "godly behaviour" and ὁ τῆς δ. στέφανος (4.8) may be "the crown of



"Walk as children of the light, for the fruit of light is found ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθωσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. These three terms refer to the ethical quality of life and perhaps represent obligations to the self, the neighbour and to God. The same idea is implied in θύραξ τῆς δικαιοσύνης at 6:14, which means the power regulating the life of the Christian, without special reference to "justification by faith".

There has been some discussion among exegetes about the correct interpretation of δικαιοσύνη in Rom.8:10-  
 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν διὰ δικαιοσύνην. The setting in antithesis of "the body (of man) dead because of sin" may suggest that πνεῦμα here refers to the spirit of man quickened by the presence of Christ for the attainment (διὰ = "for the sake of, so that") of ethical righteousness or obedience (thus Lietzmann<sup>1</sup> and Lagrange<sup>2</sup>); but that interpretation would require εἰς δικαιοσύνην rather than διὰ δ. Hence the reference must be to the Spirit of God (as in the whole context) which the use of ζῶν itself might suggest. The Spirit is at work, giving life to a man because of justification, because of "good life" (Sehrenk) or "acquittal at the last Judgment". At 1 Tim.6:11 and 2 Tim 2:22 δικαιοσύνη is included as one among other marks of Christian behaviour.

1 H. Lietzmann, An die Römer, (4 ed. Tübingen, 1933) ad loc.

2 M.-J. Lagrange, Épître aux Romains (Paris, 1931) p.199.



he has been rightly related to God, in whose gift the Spirit lies. The NEB renders the verse "The Spirit is life itself, because you have been justified", and T.W. Manson speaks of "life which comes from God because we are now right with him".<sup>1</sup> "Almsgiving" or "benevolence" might be suggested as the meaning of δικαιοσύνη in the quotations from Ps.112:9 and Hos. 10:12 at 2 Cor. 9:9f. because the context is concerned with the "collection": but, in view of the fact that v.8 speaks of "every good work", δικαιοσύνη is more likely to mean the general righteousness of life, of which charity is an expression.

Because of the assumed divergence in doctrine between Paul and James, it will be valuable to refer at this point to the use of δικαιοσύνη in the latter. (i) Ch. 1:20, ὁργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργάζεται : this must be a reference to the works of righteousness such as God may approve and which cannot be promoted by wrath and violence. (ii) 3:18, καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην . The same uncertainty prevails here as at Phil. 1:11 concerning the interpretation of the genitive, but it seems best to take it as a genitive of apposition or content, and to understand the term as connoting a righteousness which is the harvest of a life

<sup>1</sup> Romans, in New Peake, p.946. Cf. K.Barth, The Epistle to the Romans (ET, London, 1933) p.286 ". . because of the righteousness which has been established in Him".



devoted to the will of God. (iii) At 2:23 James uses Gen. 15:6 to prove that Abraham was righteous in God's sight on the basis of what he did, viz. his offering of Isaac. His faith was accompanied by and demonstrated by works. The difference between this and Pauline teaching may be quite small when it is remembered that (a) in the context of James' thought, "faith" connotes mere credal orthodoxy rather than that personal trust which unites a man to Christ, and (b) that "works" means, not the detailed observance of law in the Rabbinic sense, but Christian action, practical love and service, and these, according to Paul are the characteristics of Christian living. Nevertheless, it must be granted that Paul could not have agreed with James' contention that Abraham was justified on the ground of his action (albeit of sacrificial obedience) which accompanied and authenticated his faith. But, on the other hand, both would have been at one in desiring "faith" which produces the right kind of obedience.<sup>1</sup>

We come now to the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and especially to Rom. 1:17 and 3:21ff. Very familiar is the "text" of the letter to the Romans; "I am not ashamed of

<sup>1</sup> The polemic of James is directed against a doctrine of "faith without works" which is different from what Paul meant by "faith apart from works of the law". Was the former a development from the latter, comparable with the Corinthian libertinism? Cf. A. Schlatter, Der Brief des Jakobus, (2 Auf. Stuttgart, 1956) p. 51ff.



the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation<sup>1</sup> for everyone who believes (or, has faith), the Jew first and then the Gentiles too: δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γεγραπται, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ῥησεται. Exegetes and theologians have long argued whether δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ here means a divine attribute, i.e. God is righteous, or the gift of righteousness which God grants to the believer and as a result of which God can proclaim the believer righteous. This debate has been complicated and perpetuated by confessional differences and loyalties. The Roman tradition has been inclined to insist on righteousness as an effectual gift which transformed the nature of the believer: the Reformed tradition has tended to emphasise righteousness as an attribute of God in virtue of which he makes a declaration in favour of the believer, who remains, in himself, what he was before. The basic error holding these views irreconcilably apart lies in the static modes of thought followed in mediaeval theology and insufficiently discarded by Reformed theology. With the increasing study of the LXX and the Hebraic background of Paul's vocabulary, however, it has become clear to both Protestant and Roman Catholic exegetes that the "righteous-

<sup>1</sup> Judaism had developed the idea that the Torah is power (Mek. Ex. 15.13, 44a; S. Num. 6.24; Pesikta 147b). Consequently in the life of the Jew, the Torah, the revelation of the will of God became a power of salvation unto bliss eternal. Paul may be countering that position here.



ness of God" is essentially a term involving action. For example, the Jesuit scholar S. Lyonnet, writing on the meaning of iustitia Dei in Rom. 1:17 emphasises those OT passages in Isaiah and the Psalms where צדקת יהוה is parallel to "salvation": after quoting several of these, he asks, "Can we doubt that Paul is indebted for the meaning of this expression to these texts, so clear and having similar contexts?"<sup>1</sup> The error of other opinions he attributes to the persistence of ideas of vindictive or distributive justice, or to dogmatic preoccupations. Many scholars agree with the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in terms of "salvation". F.J. Leenhardt, for example, emphasises Ps. 98:2 in particular, and speaks of "the revelation of the saving righteousness of God", and in a fuller interpretation, "The preaching of the Gospel is the power of God for salvation, because it reveals the mercy of God operating to make salvation available to man, in other words, what Paul calls the righteousness of God"<sup>2</sup> Now, if one stresses the importance of Isaiah and the Psalms for the understanding of Rom. 1:17, and assumes Paul's knowledge of the phrase צדקת יהוה, then one must credit the Apostle with awareness of the distinction between "righteousness" and "salvation" which pertains to the Is. passages and is implied

<sup>1</sup> Verbum Domini, XXV (1947), p.29.

<sup>2</sup> Leenhardt, op.cit., p.54.



in Romans. The two ideas are admittedly very close, but the words are not strictly synonymous. "Salvation" is the situation or state of affairs ushered in as a result of Yahweh's righteous decision for Israel or his righteous verdict upon them. Leenhardt neglects this distinction, although he rightly stresses the Hebrew background of Paul's thought. C.H. Dodd makes a fairer judgment: "Righteousness is not primarily an attribute of God or of his people, but an activity whereby the right is asserted",<sup>1</sup> i.e. it is God's doing of the right and his seeing right done. This righteousness issues in God's vindication of those whom it is fitting he should vindicate, and even (in the case of Pauline theology) of those who have no claim whatever to his action on their behalf. In the Romans passage under discussion, it seems that δικαιοσύνη is not parallel to σωτηρία but to the phrase δύνάμεις θεοῦ ... εἰς σωτηρίαν, i.e. God's action which results in salvation.

Attempts have been made throughout the history of exegesis to interpret δ. θεοῦ here of the "righteousness" given by God to man, which has its root in faith. This is how Lagrange understands it,<sup>2</sup> and E.F. Scott says that "Paul means by righteousness that condition of

<sup>1</sup> Dodd, op.cit., p.12. The action reveals that, on his side, God is faithful to his people even when they have broken the covenant relationship. This is probably part of the reference within δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> Lagrange, op.cit., ad loc. 1:17.



soul which God requires".<sup>1</sup> We have already mentioned the attempt by A. Oepke to revive this interpretation on the basis of the claim that the Rabbinic explanation of 'יִקְרָא at Deut. 33:21 (with which Paul is assumed to have been acquainted) is "righteousness of man in the eyes of God".<sup>2</sup> Oepke's argument is seriously affected by our discovery that this Rabbinic rendering of 'יִקְרָא was not common and may, in the discussion of Deut. 33:21, have been dictated by special circumstances. Again the confirmation of his claim sought in Test. Dan. 6:10, ἀποστήτε οὖν ἀπὸ πάσης ἁδικίας καὶ κολλήθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ (i.e. "righteousness before God") must take seriously the likelihood of post-Christian influence at this point, as well as the possibility that τοῦ νόμου between τοῦ and θεοῦ (attested by α A β 8') may be original. Oepke's interpretation of Rom. 1:17 brings the meaning of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ very close to that of Phil. 3:9 where τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην is regarded as referring to the righteousness of the Christian life which has its source in God. But is that what is meant in Rom. 1:17? We have pointed out earlier that Phil. 3:9 seems most satisfactorily interpreted in terms of the status of being righteous before God, i.e. justification, and that, we think, is part of the meaning of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Rom. 1:17. In other

<sup>1</sup> The Epistle to the Romans, (London, 1947) p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> TLZ, 1953, pp. 257-64.



words, we consider that Paul has in mind both God's vindicating judgment (in loyalty to his covenant) and the status (implied) which this gives to man.<sup>1</sup>

We begin with the word "salvation". This term, in Judaism, belongs to the framework of eschatological thinking, but, in Christian teaching, the salvation which will be fully revealed at the last time has been anticipated in the present through the death and resurrection of the Messiah. Consequently the Gospel is not merely an announcement that salvation will take place in the future, but a divine activity and power leading to salvation now. Paul knows, however, that salvation presupposes righteousness. It was a common-place of Jewish theology. On God's side, salvation begins in the operation of his own righteousness, i.e. his action in doing right and in seeing right done: in Deutero-Isaiah that action means his vindicating verdict on behalf of those who do not deserve it, but to whom he commits himself in mercy and love. On man's side, salvation requires that he be found righteous before God, that in the divine judgment he should secure a favourable verdict. Thus before salvation can be completed, righteousness must be manifested: God the righteous judge must give righteous judgment, and man must secure a favourable verdict. Now Paul declares that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, (E.T. London, 1952) pp. 75-76.



this righteousness of God (not "salvation", for that is what the "righteousness" leads to) is now being revealed ( ἀποκαλύπτεται ). This is the preliminary manifestation of that divine "righteousness" which, in orthodox Jewish thought, could be vindicated only at the Last Judgment.

Paul, the Christian, is convinced that this judgment (and in some measure its consequences) has been anticipated through Jesus Christ, and that in the paradox of grace, God has manifested his righteousness by establishing man's. 1

Therefore, in the Gospel, there is revealed both the righteous action and judgment of God (which proves His righteousness) and the possibility of the status of "righteousness" for man in the eyes of God. Moreover, this is being revealed ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν . Various interpretations of this formula are put forward, but, if what Paul says in the first half of v.17 is to harmonise with what he quotes in the second part, it is necessary that ἐκ πίστεως should modify δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ . The righteousness revealed in the Gospel is based on "faith" and obtained "by faith" and it is revealed unto all who have faith, i.e. εἰς πίστιν , for it is written, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται . As in Gal. 3 the context demands that this be interpreted "he who is righteous on the basis of faith shall live". 2 This agrees

1 C.K. Barrett, op.cit., p.30.

2 So Beza, Lagrange, Goguel, Kuhl, Cerfaux, Barrett, Nygren, Schweitzer, Schoeps, Contra: Zahn, Dodd, Sanday and Headlam, Michael, Lyonnet, Schrenk, Leenhardt, Schlatter, Lightfoot and E.E. Ellis,



with the intention of the Apostle: as A. Feuillet puts it:

Son dessein n'est pas en effet d'établir comment le juste vivra, mais bien plutôt de quelle espèce de justice l'homme doit être revêtu pour pouvoir vivre: est-ce celle de la foi ou celle des oeuvres?

1

The word *ῥύσεται* may suggest both the inheriting of salvation at the end and the course of Christian living.

Having pointed out that *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* at 3:5 must mean exclusively the "righteousness of God in judgment", we come to the great passage, 3:21ff, in the study of which the strands of our discussion may be brought together. This passage is one of the turning-points of the epistle. The law has been proved ineffectual in bestowing righteousness on man: all, without distinction, stand under condemnation, guilty before God: *ὡν δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας* .<sup>2</sup>

As the passage proceeds, the two aspects of *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* are set forth: God's righteousness has been manifested apart from law, and the action shows "that he is righteous in himself" and that "he justifies" (26): God's righteousness includes the quality of "being in the right or right-

<sup>1</sup> "La citation d'Hab.2:4 et les huit premiers chapitres de l'épître aux Romains", *NTS*, VI, (1959-60) pp.52ff. The article gives the details of the works of those authors referred to in the preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> The parallel in thought and expression with 1:17 is close: *πεφανέρωται* corresponds to *ἀποκαλύπτεται* ; *διὰ πίστεως* to *ἐκ πίστεως* , and *εἰς πάντας τοὺς π.* to *εἰς πίστιν* .



eous"<sup>1</sup> and the activity of doing right, of putting a person in the right, bestowing a status which is also called "righteousness". Moreover, it is a "righteousness" of God which is "through faith in Jesus Christ" and "for all who have faith". "Faith" is the sole means by which a man can enter into the relationship with God or status before God which is rightly called δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, for it is the gift of his grace. Man does not deserve it, for "all have sinned" but are also "δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ", which does not mean that they were made ethically virtuous or righteous, nor that they were treated as if they were righteous though they were not: it means "they were put in the clear (in God's court) and given the status of 'not guilty'". This verdict is made possible because Christ died and his atoning death dealt with sin and thereby made it possible for God to righteously forgive. Here again, justification and atonement are brought together: justification rests on the propitiatory sacrifice which reconciles (ἱλαστήριον). The wrath of God against sin required his righteous judgment upon it so that his own righteousness might be maintained and that he might justify, might put in the right, those who have faith in

<sup>1</sup> As well as "righteousness" of personal character and action we ought also to remember that God's righteousness includes the idea of his loyalty to the covenant-people. His action proves his "in-the-right-ness" (with reference to covenant-faithfulness) over against man's "unrighteousness".



Christ (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιούντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ ). The death of Christ further manifested the righteousness of God, because, in the past, God had merely overlooked men's sins:<sup>1</sup> now, in the Cross, they were being dealt with by decisive action.

The Cross anticipates the results of the Last Judgment; the Judge of all the earth is seen to do right, and, since he chooses to bear himself, in the person of his Son, the affliction antecedent to the Age to Come, he is able righteously to justify those who believe.

2

And that faith, as chapters 5 and 6 make abundantly clear, is the means of uniting the believer with Christ in his atoning death and resurrection life, in which surrender is the locus of "justification".

Finally, at Rom. 10:3, Paul speaks of his fellow-Jews: ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν [δικαιοσύνην ᾧ<sup>46</sup> ἔτε.] ζητοῦντες στήσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χρῆστος εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι . Some commentators regard τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην as the ethical or qualitative righteousness which is granted to the believer by God. The passage then means: the Jews sought that righteousness which they thought was achieved by obedience to the law, because they did not under-

<sup>1</sup> This interpretation of παράσις provides a better link with what precedes and follows in Paul's argument. If he had meant "pardon" or "forgiveness" the word ἄφεσις was available.

2 Barrett, op.cit., p.80.



stand the righteousness which comes from God as a gift, and therefore they failed to submit themselves to God's righteousness. This interpretation seems to involve a weakening of the force of the last clause. Unless the second δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means "Christ, as the embodiment of the divine righteousness" (as Leenhardt suggests<sup>1</sup>) we must surely see it as a reference to the way of acceptance ordained by God.<sup>2</sup> In the light of this, it is likely that the first δικαιοσύνη connotes, not a quality, but the way of being justified which God has appointed. This the Jews did not understand, and so continued to try to establish their own way of acceptance, viz. obedience to the Law. This way (Paul declares) is not valid, because (i) Christ is the end (τέλος) of the Law, so that "righteousness" (the status of being righteous or acceptable) may be available to all who have faith,<sup>3</sup> and (ii) the law itself proclaimed that "faith" (the object of which is Christ) and not law, is the way to righteousness, as the case of Abraham proved (Gen. 15:6).

Apart from Paul's writings the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ occurs at James 1:20 and 2 Pet. 1:1. In the former, it

1 op.cit., p.265.

2 S. Lyonnet, op.cit., p.118, "δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ denotes the saving initiatives of God".

3 If τέλος is interpreted as "purpose, intention, fulfilment", then εἰς δικαιοσύνην must mean "by bringing about righteousness, 'justification', for the believer".



means, as we have already mentioned, "what is right in God's eyes, right conduct of which he may approve". In the second passage, the word is used in an indeterminate way in the formula, "to those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" where δικαιοσύνη appears to be "the distributive justice of God which apportions to each man his due (so Bultmann) or "God's just government of the Christian community, giving equal privileges to all".<sup>1</sup>

This discussion of Pauline usage makes clear the following points.

1. The verb δικαίω does not seem to be used in the Epistle nor, in fact, in any of the New Testament documents, in either of the senses normally attaching to it in non-Jewish and non-Christian Greek writers: it does not mean "to deem right" nor "to treat justly, to do a person right".
  - (a) Its use in the active form is essentially that of the LXX δικαίω, as the translation of the Hebrew ק'צח and means "to cause to be in the right", "to put someone in the right" by giving judgment in his favour.
  - (b) In the middle and passive forms, it reflects the LXX rendering of the Qal of קצח "to be in the right, righteous", again before the bar of judgment.

Consequently, we may say that it is primarily and predom-  
 1 Schrenk, op.cit., p.35.



inantly a forensic term,<sup>1</sup> a word of the law-court, describing a relation to, or a status before God, the judge of all men. It is not a case of God "making righteous" a person who is not so: by his sovereign will, He "puts in the right" or "treats as in the right" the person who is in the relationship of faith (i.e. trust, surrender, identification) to Jesus Christ, in whom (and supremely in his death and resurrection) the righteousness of God in covenant-faithfulness to men has been manifested.

2. The words δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη also possess a wide area of meaning essentially strange to Greek usage, but related to the Hebrew נָפֶטֶל and the LXX δικαιοσύνη. When the word refers to that upon which salvation is based, δικαιο-  
σύνη is a forensic term: it is "the status of being in the right" graciously given by God. In the words of Bultmann,

It does not mean the ethical quality of a person. It does not mean any quality at all, but a relationship. That is, δικαιοσύνη is not something a person has as his own; rather it is something he has in the verdict of the "forum".... to which he is accountable. He has it in the opinion adjudicated to him by another. 2

When applied to God, δικαιοσύνη refers to his being "in the right" by reason of his loyalty to the covenant, and to his

1 Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to contemporary Jewish thought, (London, 1900) p.87.

2 R. Bultmann, op.cit., p.272. B. points out that for Paul, in common with Jewish thought, δικαιοσύνη was a forensic term: while the hope of "being justified" remained, for the Jew, a matter of eschatology, for Paul it is also a present reality.



action in "setting men right", bestowing a "righteous" status, an action which leads to their salvation.

In a manner akin to Greek usage, both δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη are used in an ethical or qualitative sense. This is the case when they refer to that "righteousness" which must characterise Christian living in obedience to the will of God and the law of Christ. While δικαιοσύνη may thus be regarded as a virtue, there is an important difference between Christian "righteousness" and Greek "justice". The difference lies in the standard with reference to which conduct is assessed as "righteous". For the Greek δικαιοσύνη was thought of predominantly in terms of what was good within and for the community or the state; it was the proper fulfilment of a man's duties as a citizen. On the other hand, in Paul, while social justice was included in man's δικαιοσύνη (as in the prophets), this was placed within the context of something greater: "righteousness" is essentially related to the demands of the will of God. This is the insight of OT teaching and religion, and Paul retains it, adding his own Christian interpretation. The will of God for the new community of the Covenant has been made known in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Obedience to this is the "righteousness" of life which God expects and which will lead to the consummation of the favourable verdict, in the mercy of God, at the Last Day.



We may claim then with confidence that Paul's use of the δίκαιος group of words is rooted in Biblical-Greek usage, rather than in that of Classical Greek writers. The meaning of his terms reflects the Hebrew root  $\text{פָּרַח}$  which was consistently rendered in the LXX by δίκαιός etc. Acknowledgement of this fact has provided us with an essential clue to the interpretation of Paul's language of "justification". Now we may ask whether the faith which was expressed in the language to which Paul was indebted also provided him with the doctrine he set forth in those (borrowed) terms: in other words, does the OT provide the substructure of Paul's doctrine of "justification by faith"? In some measure, it does. Not only do we find in the OT the declaration of God's "righteousness" in his character as faithful and in-the-right with reference to the covenant-relationship, but we also find in the prophets and especially in the Psalms that "the righteous", those who are "in the right", are those who have a profound trust in the divine mercy and seek to do his will. Is not this a foretaste of the essential spirit of Paul's doctrine? That this kind of piety continued as one strand of Jewish religion is proved by the contents of the Qumran scrolls, in the Manual of Discipline, and especially the Hodayot. In our discussion of these, we referred to their expressions of human weakness and of the justification (i.e. the judging as righteous



טפס) of the sinner by faith in God's forgiving mercy, which justification was grounded in God's righteousness (צדקה). The new materials therefore show that the question of the means whereby God accepts the sinner was not forgotten, but remained an issue about which people were concerned, at least in sectarian circles. We also drew attention to the fact (which we here reiterate) that, while these Qumran ideas certainly provide anticipations of the Pauline doctrine of justificatio sola fide, they are also a continuation of the Psalmenfrömmigkeit.

Out of the OT and pre-Christian sectarian Judaism came the framework of Paul's doctrine and the materials of his thinking as he faced a degenerate, legalistic religion, but the special content which his doctrine possesses was his own. Two factors provided it. First, he was writing at a particular moment in the life of the Church: the doctrine of "justification by faith" was crystallised in opposition to the thesis of contemporary Judaism that acceptance with God was based on merit achieved by works of the Law. As a result of the controversy, the doctrine gained a precise statement and a pronounced negative reference, "not by works". The second factor contributing to the uniqueness of the Pauline doctrine is vastly more important. Paul writes from the standpoint of belief in Jesus as the Messiah. He begins with the Cross and Resurrection and, from this



centre, rethinks the entire realm of theology and religion, including the doctrine of the means of justification. The sola fide of Jewish evangelical piety becomes sola fide Christi. Faith gains its characteristic Christian connotation - trust in an identification with Christ in his saving act - and justification its reference both to God's supremely righteous act and to man's acceptability as "in the right" in Christ alone. Greatly indebted though Paul is to the best in Jewish thought, it is his understanding of the Christ-event and the influence of that understanding on his theology that makes his doctrine of justification something different from, and an advance upon the deep spiritual insights of the Old Testament and of Qumran piety.<sup>1</sup> We cannot claim to have understood the Pauline doctrine when we have located anticipations of it in the religious faith of Judaism.

<sup>1</sup> See on this S. Schuls, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus", ZTK, LVI, (1959) pp. 155-85, and W. Grundmann, "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran und die Frage nach der Glaubensgerechtigkeit in der Theologie des Apostels Paulus, Revue de Qumran, II, (1959-60) pp. 237-59: "Die Besonderheit des Paulus liegt nicht in besonderen Begriffen und Gedanken, auch nicht in ihrer neuen Anordnung in einem neuen theologischen System, sondern in ihrer strengen Bezogenheit auf den Christus Jesus, dem Paulus begegnet ist und der fortan sein Leben in Zeit und Ewigkeit bestimmt. Paulus kennt in dem gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Jesus den verheissenen Messias, der in Qumran erwartet wird, aber unbekannt geliebt ist" (p. 259).



SOME IMPORTANT SOTERIOLOGICAL TERMS  
IN THE  
NEW TESTAMENT  
- A STUDY IN BIBLICAL SEMANTICS -

VOLUME TWO





Ta 5214



THE BACKGROUND AND BIBLICAL USAGE  
OF THE TERMS  $\xi\omega\eta$  and  $\xi\omega\eta$   $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$

	Page
I. The Old Testament Usage	310
Supplementary Note on the form $\square'?\square$	321
II. The Classical Greek Usage of $\xi\omega\eta$	322
III. The Usage of the Septuagint	326
IV. The Inter-Testamental Literature	328
V. Philo Judaeus	333
VI. The Hermetic Literature	339
VII. The Rabbinic Literature	344
VIII. The Dead Sea Scrolls	349
IX. The Meaning and Use of $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$	355
X. The Use of $\xi\omega\eta$ $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the New Testament	362
Part 1. Paul	362
Part 2. The Synoptic Gospels	367
Part 3. The Fourth Gospel	369
XI. Summary	385



# THE OLD TESTAMENT USAGE

In the Old Testament there are two words which, in English versions, are frequently rendered by "life": these are  $\square''\square$  and  $\psi\text{ח}^{\text{ח}}$ . The latter is regularly translated in the Septuagint by  $\psi\text{υχ}^{\text{ח}}$  but never by  $\psi\text{ω}^{\text{ח}}$  while  $\square''\square$  and related words are almost always rendered by  $\psi\text{ω}^{\text{ח}}$  and cognate words.<sup>1</sup> Since the primary concern of this study is the investigation of the Greek word  $\psi\text{ω}^{\text{ח}}$ , our attention will therefore be directed towards the understanding of the use and meaning of  $\square''\square$ . Nevertheless it would be unwise to ignore completely the word  $\psi\text{ח}^{\text{ח}}$ , since knowledge of its meaning may help us towards a more precise understanding of  $\square''\square$ .

While being aware of the danger of imposing a false uniformity on Hebrew thought by offering a general meaning for this much-discussed term, we may, with some assurance, say that  $\psi\text{ח}^{\text{ח}}$  connotes the vitality which animates the body and is associated with the activity of breathing<sup>2</sup> (the "breath-soul": Gen.2:7; 35:18, 1 Kings 17:22) and with the presence of blood (the "blood-soul": Gen.9:4, Deut. 12:23, Lev. 17:11, 14). Being the vital element in a

<sup>1</sup> On a few occasions  $\psi\text{υχ}^{\text{ח}}$  appears in the LXX where  $\square''\square$  or  $\square''\square$  stands in the M.T. These will be dealt with later.

<sup>2</sup> "There is no reason to doubt that the primary meaning of nephesh was "breath", like that of the Arabic nafsun - soul (nafasun = breath), though there is but one instance in the OT in which "breath" is the most natural rendering (Job 41: 19,20)." H.W. Robinson, Hebrew Psychology, in The People and The Book, ed. A.S. Peake (Oxford, 1928) p.356.



man's being alive,  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  frequently assumes the slightly wider meaning of "a man's life" as a physical entity (e.g. Gen.12:13; 19:19,20): "to spare or save a  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$ " means "to spare or save a life."<sup>1</sup> A further development of meaning takes place when the vitality or "alive-ness" is particularised and indicates certain living beings. Then  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  means "individual person", "someone" (plural = "persons" or "people") or denotes "self" or the personal pronoun. As examples of the former we may quote Gen.12:5, "Abram brought to Canaan  $\text{נַפְשׁוֹ וְנַפְשׁוֹתָם}$  i.e. each person they had gotten in Haran", and also Ex.1:5, "All the offspring of Jacob were seventy  $\text{נַפְשׁוֹת}$  or persons!"<sup>2</sup> of the latter,  $\text{אֲנִי}$  at Gen. 27:4 = "I", at 27:19  $\text{אַתָּה}$  = "thou" and at 23:8  $\text{אַתָּה}$  = "you".<sup>3</sup> In a third main group of usages the psychical relation of  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  becomes prominent, although (as H.W. Robinson reminds us<sup>4</sup>) for the Hebrews "psychical" includes much that we should call "physiological" since they did not distinguish the two. Here  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  denotes the organ of self-expression:<sup>5</sup> it is the seat of appetites such as

1 Also Gen.19:17; 37:21; 44:30, 2 Kings 1:13, Ps.6:4, etc.

2 Also Ex.12:4,15,16,19; Lev.4:2,27; 8:1,2,4,15,17 (  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  = anyone, a person).

3 Also Is.44:20;47:14, 51:23, Psalm 3:2, etc.

4 Robinson, op.cit., p.356.

5 Cf. Th.Vriesen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p.202, "  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  is the motor impulse in a man's life, physically as well as psychically".



hunger (Lam.1:11) and thirst (Is.29:8), of emotions and passions, such as love (Gen.44:30), disgust (Num.21:5), hatred (2 Sam.5:8), anger, wrath and sorrow. It may be, however, that in these cases  $\psi\text{ׁ}\text{ׂ}$  retains the suggestion of the "whole being", since an intense desire or emotion may express the attitude or response of the whole person at a particular moment. Thus, we may claim that  $\psi\text{ׁ}\text{ׂ}$ , while basically denoting the essential element of vitality (identified with "breath" and/or "blood"), develops an objective and a subjective aspect: objectively, it is applied to a man in his being alive and active, that which makes the difference between a living body and a corpse, and then, with increased definiteness, denotes that which constitutes a living human body a person; subjectively, it indicates the centre of internal activities (physical and emotional) and so becomes identified, to some extent, with the source and spring of human personality.

The word to which we give greater attention is

$\square\text{ׁ}\text{ׂ}\square$  . This plural form has been variously explained, but, since form contributes little to the understanding of meaning, we have merely added a note at the end of this section on the problems connected with this plural. As far as usage is concerned, we may begin with the application of the term to ordinary physical existence (s) in relation to its antithesis, physical death (Jer.21:8, Jos.



2:13), (b) in relation to time only, representing the continuance of the existence of a person in possession of his various activities: thus we read of "the days of one's life" (Deut. 4:9, 1 Sam. 7:15), "the years of one's life" (Gen. 23:1, Ex. 6:16), and "the days of the years of one's life" (Gen. 25:7; 47:9), and (c) in relation to actions and events which occur during a lifetime or are the results of man's energies and activities, e.g. valorous deeds (Jud. 16:30), marriage (Lev. 18:18), praising God (Ps. 104:33) and even enjoyments (Ecc. 3:12).

Although the Old Testament does not present a unified or systematic account of the nature and purpose of human life, there are sufficient suggestions in the use of חַיָּה to justify the claim that, in Israelite faith, "life" is something more than the continuance of mere physical existence.<sup>1</sup> There is a clear recognition of the distinct character and dignity of man's life. It is true that, like man, the animals were created by God and that each, like man, was נִפְחָה בְּרוּחַ חַיָּה (Gen. 1:21, 24; 2:7), but into man alone did "God breathe the breath of life, נִפְחָה בְּרוּחַ חַיָּה":<sup>2</sup> man's life is, in a specially direct way, the gift of God. The

<sup>1</sup> "Life is experienced as something that essentially transcends purely material existence and that therefore represents something 'numinous' for the ancient Hebrews", O.A. Piper, Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Man's rank above the animals is stated by Gen. 1 and presupposed by Gen. 2 in that Adam gives to the animals their names.



high place given to man by God in His world-order is reflected in the character and content of the life man may enjoy.

Life to be worthy of the name must not be mere existence, but exuberant, joyous life to which the possession of goods, family and wealth contribute. When the Israelites say, "Let the king live, יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ" (1 Kings 1:25, 2 Sam. 16:16) their desire is not exhausted by his being granted continuance of earthly life: they desire that he should be rich and great, strong in himself and for his people (cf. Ps. 72:15). "May the king live for ever" they also say (1 Kings 1:31, Dan. 2:4) for life shows its strength in not perishing, and long life was a sign of honour (Prov. 3:16).<sup>1</sup> Blessing, honour, life and joy are expressions which are closely connected, especially in the Wisdom literature (cf. Prov. 21:21, 22:4.).

Man's life, however, consists not simply in the abundance of the good things he possesses: it consists rather in what he is by virtue of his goals and ideals. Again the Wisdom literature is important. The pessimistic outlook which characterises the Book of Ecclesiastes focuses attention on enjoyment, but the book of Proverbs inculcates something vastly different. There the ideal is the good life, the life of righteousness. "In the paths of righteousness

<sup>1</sup> See J. Pedersen, Israel: its Life and Culture I-II (London, 1926) pp. 152ff.



is life" (Prov. 12:28, 11:19, 10:16); wisdom is the source and means of life (3:2, 8:35); instruction is life, חַיִּים (4:22) and the fear of the Lord leads to life (19:23). In the same pregnant sense we read of "the way of life" (6:23, 10:17) and "the fountain of life" (13:14, 14:27, 16:22), both of which are often equated with obedience, righteousness and wisdom.

The spirit of these passages, and indeed their vocabulary, is Deuteronomic. We recall the utterance of Deut.8:3: "Man lives ( חַיִּים ) by everything which proceeds from the mouth of the Lord", and Deut.30:15-16:

See, I have set before you this day life ( חַיִּים ) and good, death and evil. If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you this day, by loving the Lord your God, by walking in his ways and by keeping his commandments and his statutes and his ordinances, then you shall live ( חַיִּים ) and multiply, and the Lord your God will bless you:

and Deut.30:20 ". . loving the Lord your God, obeying his voice and cleaving to him, that is your life ( חַיִּים ) and the length of your days". The Holiness code expresses the same point of view: Lev. 18:5 (quoted at Neh. 9:29 and developed at Ezek.18:21) "You shall keep my statutes and ordinances, by doing which a man shall live ( חַיִּים )". The choice between life and death confronts man: by hearkening to the word and will of God he will live.<sup>1</sup> Real life is

I BDE remark (p.311) that חַיִּים often has "the pregnant sense of fulness of life in the divine favour".



obedience and righteousness.

Als zeitlich-leibliches Leben hat es seine Eigentlichkeit, wenn es lang und glücklich ist. Und diese Möglichkeit ist insoweit in die Hand des Menschen gelegt, als er sich ein langes und glückliches Leben durch seinen Gehorsam unter Gottes Gesetz oder die Gebote der Weisheit erwirbt oder durch seinen Ungehorsam den Tod, so dass für ihn die Wahl zwischen dem Weg des Lebens und dem Weg des Todes besteht (Ps. 16:11, Prov.6:23, 10:17, 14:12). 1

Amos presents the same challenge to Israel: "Seek the Lord and live" (5:4,6) where the word "live" means more than physical survival in the midst of disaster (though not survival in the hereafter) and approaches the idea of living in fellowship and right relation with God. The "seeking of the Lord" which makes this life possible means seeking good and not evil, loving good, establishing justice and fairness where injustice and dishonesty existed (vs.14 and 15). In the well-known but difficult verse in Habakkuk 2:4 ("by his faithfulness, i.e. loyalty to Yahweh and his covenant, the righteous man shall live") the verb חָיָה seems to connote continuance of life in the time of the nation's judgment by the Chaldean invasion.

We turn now to comment on the idea of life in its fulness through consciousness of fellowship with God. The Psalms have many expressions of this theme. For instance, Ps.16:10-11: "Thou dost not give me up to Sheol or let thy godly one see the Pit. Thou dost show me the path of life"  
I R. Bultmann, TWNT, vol.2, p.853.



( םִיִּן בְּיָמַי ): in thy presence there is fulness of joy and in thy right hand are pleasures for evermore." Opinions differ as to the interpretation of these verses. Against the view that the writer believes in a full life after death it is pointed out that "death" and similar terms frequently connote diminished vitality or deep affliction: to be "restored to life" or "delivered from Sheol" will mean to be "re-established in vigour and well-being". If this is the case, the Psalmist's total meaning will be that Yahweh delivers him from the present affliction (which brought him near to death) and will enable him to live to a ripe old age. On the other hand the view is still maintained that the Psalmist means that, when he dies, he will not descend to Sheol but will live a full life with Yahweh. Even if this latter interpretation is rejected, the Psalm clearly declares that communion with God is the supreme good, and that is a central element in the final Biblical view of life after death.<sup>1</sup> This element finds expression in Ps. 73:23ff.

I am continually with thee:  
Thou dost hold my right hand,  
Thou dost guide me with thy counsel  
And afterward thou wilt receive me to (in) glory.  
Whom have I in heaven but thee?  
And there is nothing on earth I desire beside thee:  
My heart and my flesh may fail,  
But Yahweh is the strength of my heart  
And my portion for ever.

<sup>1</sup> For this succinct comment (as for that on Ps.73) I am dependent on G.W. Anderson's commentary on Psalms in the new edition of Peake's Commentary on the Bible.



The Hebrew does not suggest life beyond death as strongly as the English versions, and some think that only blessing and deliverance in this life are being referred to, but (a) "afterward" seems to be parallel to "their end" (v.17), the ultimate fate of the wicked: (b) the verb נָפַח ("receive") may well be used in the special sense of God taking a man hence:<sup>1</sup> and (c) the context of the passage describes an experience of Yahweh's presence which is fullness of life in spite of present affliction and injustice, and which the Psalmist considers unbreakable.<sup>2</sup> G. von Rad has rightly warned against seeing in expressions of this kind any dramatic religious breakthrough (Durchbruch):<sup>3</sup> in Israel's thought security and joy come only from a sense of Yahweh's presence, and what we have in these statements of personal faith is a special emphasis on the unlimited extension of this life-fellowship (Lebensgemeinschaft), even beyond death.<sup>4</sup> This, however, does not indicate a general belief in a resurrection after death: the possibility of life beyond death depends on a personal relation-

<sup>1</sup> The idea of "rapture" was current in Israel and in ancient Babylon. It is illustrated in the taking of Elijah (2 Kings 2:1) and of Enoch (Gen. 5:24): cf. also Ps. 49:15.

<sup>2</sup> J. Pedersen, "Wisdom and Immortality" VT, Suppl. III, (1955) p.245, "The approaches to a belief in an individual resurrection found in the OT are due to a demand for the accomplishment of justice".

<sup>3</sup> Theologie des Alten Testaments, Band I (Munich, 1957), p. 404.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Band III, (Leipzig, 1939) p.165.



ship of special, almost exceptional, intimacy with Yahweh.<sup>1</sup> This personal casting of oneself upon Yahweh in life, which brings the faithful over the threshold of death, undergoes a profound change in apocalyptic thought with its expectation of a collective resurrection of the faithful (Is.26:19, "thy dead shall live, חַיִּים יִהְיֶה")<sup>2</sup> caused by the vivifying "dews" of God, and later of a more general resurrection, of some to eternal damnation, some to eternal life, חַיִּים וְחַיִּים Dan.12:2<sup>3</sup> - the first and only time in the OT canon when these words appear. The old reserve towards ideas of a life after death, caused by distrust for the dying and rising gods of mythology (cf. Ezek.8:14), has been overcome now in Israel, and it is possible to state in a new form the victory of life over death for the faithful.<sup>4</sup> No picture is drawn of the conditions of this coming time:

1 The significance of this is increased if we regard the "I" of the Lament-psalms as the king, high-priest or prophet. For the view that there is no belief in immortality or resurrection in these Psalms see C. Barth, Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des AT (Basel, 1947). Ps.75 probably came from wisdom circles.

2 This passage is contained in the so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah which almost all scholars consider as post-exilic. Some have dated it in the Maccabean period, others in the 4th cent. B.C.

3 It is now almost universally agreed among scholars that the book of Daniel, as we now have it, was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, 175-163 B.C.

4 For a study of the development of the doctrine of resurrection, see H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the OT", ST, III, (1950) pp.60-78. He makes a distinction between the possibility of a life beyond



the form of the expression **חַיִּיךָ** makes it clear that it connotes "life of the remotest time (forwards)",<sup>1</sup> the life of perpetuity, i.e. continuing life as contrasted with continuing abhorrence and corruption.

By way of conclusion to this part of our study we may reiterate what is perhaps the most significant aspect of the Hebrew understanding of "life", namely, its being derived from God. Wherever there is life, it is His gift. "He breathed into man the breath of life" (Gen.2:7): obedience in righteousness to his will is the means of entering into the experience of his gift in its reality and fulness. The life after death is also a gift from God - the gift of His fellowship, unbroken and unbreakable, or of his resurrecting power. That life in all its aspects

death, dependent on a miracle by God (as expressed in the Psalms and Suffering Servant songs), the belief in the restoration of the people, and the actual belief in an eschatological resurrection. The last development was due, not to association with agricultural and fertility religions, but to Iranian influence on Israelite belief, when the two religions met. "There is no plain evidence of any belief in a (relatively) general resurrection of the dead in the OT before the Persian-Hellenistic time. Before that time only the belief in some exceptional wonders is testified. Still more: before the Persian-Hellenistic, we find no special attention paid to the resurrection of the body, even in the few exceptional cases mentioned" (p.75. Cf. also H.J. Kraus, RGG, Dritte Auflage, Band I, (1951) p.694.

1 The phrase is from E. Jenni, "Das Wort 'olam im AT", ZAW LXIV, (1952) pp.244ff. Cf. J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time, pp.69ff and 117ff. We cannot translate as "life of the age" since the sense of "age" or "period" for **חַיִּיךָ** is of very late origin in Hebrew, and probably does not occur in the OT, except possibly, though doubtfully, at Eccles. 3:11.



should be so dependent on God need not surprise us, for the God of the Old Testament is the Living God, active, personal and concerned with the world. Oaths are sworn by the living God, e.g. "as truly as Yahweh lives": praise is offered to the living God (Ps. 18:47, 42:3, 84:3); and in the literature of the period of the later kings the expression "the living God" occurs repeatedly.<sup>1</sup> Alive Himself, this God is the fountain of life (Ps. 36:10), its inexhaustible source. Life here and now, life after death, are given to man by Him.

Supplementary note on the form הָיִים. Some regard הָיִים as an example of the plural of mystery or majesty, denoting what escapes man's grasping. GK-Cowley lists it among the plurals which intensively focus the characteristics inherent in the idea of the stem,<sup>2</sup> so that הָיִים means "the abstract idea of the qualities of the living being". Brockelmann's comparative grammar suggests that הָיִים is an abstract noun expressed by the plural of the related concrete or adjectival form (חַי), and explains it in terms of the primitive tendency to attribute vitality to various parts of the body and not to one single source.<sup>3</sup> F.C. Burkitt has suggested<sup>4</sup> that the plural form must be interpreted as temporal, not as expressing an abstract idea. "The word is plural", he says, "because the Hebrews regarded life as consisting of successive instants or moments or days or years. A man's hayyim is the period during which he is alive". While not denying the fact that

<sup>1</sup> The emphasis on God's being alive probably developed as an antithesis to Canaanite belief in dying and rising deities. Cf. Vriezen, op.cit., p.171.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 124 a-d.

<sup>3</sup> Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, (Berlin, 1908-13) vol.2, pp.59-60.

<sup>4</sup> ZNW, XII, (1911) pp.228-30.



the Hebrews were concerned about length of life, it seems unlikely that we can read off so much about their understanding of life from the mere existence of this plural form. Still others see the word as an intensive plural denoting diversity in unity,  $\square''\square$  expressing life in its many modes and manifestations. It is impossible to explain with certainty the form of the word as we have it (and it is plural in other Semitic languages) but it may be helpful to interpret along the following lines. The word

$\square$  (adj.) means "living", "a living being" and its plural is  $\square''\square$  "living beings". That which all these living beings share, the one characteristic common to each and to all of them, is "life" or "existence", and this comes to be expressed by the same word ( $\square''\square$ ).

Whether this is so or not (and it is not our task to explain the form, but to discuss use and meaning) it soon becomes clear that the word  $\square''\square$  represents the state of being alive, with emphasis on the character and quality of the process, whereas  $\omega\omega$  emphasises the personal vitality of the being who lives.

## II. The Classical Greek Usage of $\zeta\omega\eta$ .

The noun  $\zeta\omega\eta$  appears only three times in the Homeric poems and on each occasion bears the sense "property" or "a man's substance": the  $\zeta\omega\eta$   $\delta\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (Od.14.96,208) was the "boundless store" of Odysseus which Penelope's suitors had not yet consumed, and  $\zeta\omega\eta$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\eta$  (Od.16.429) was the "abundant substance" of the pirate Euphithes. This sense of the word, though rare, is found also in Herod.8:105 and in Aristotle HA. 608b21. After Homer, the noun usually and frequently means "the physical life or existence" of living organisms (animals, men and plants), and, as such, is the opposite of "death". "Life" is not regarded as a thing, but as the "alive-ness" by which all living beings are characterised: consequently  $\zeta\omega\eta$  is scarcely ever used



in the plural. Very occasionally the word connotes "way of life".<sup>1</sup> The only examples of this which Liddell and Scott give are Herod.4.112 ζῶν ἕξωον τὴν αὐτὴν, which clearly means "they lived the same kind, or way, of life (as the Amazons)" and Herod.4.114 where ζῶν τοιγύδε connotes "the life such as we live".

From the earliest literature onwards the verb ζῆν is used of animal life, "to live": cf. ζῶεν καὶ ὄραν φάος ἡελίοιο Iliad 24.558; τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζῆν κοινὸν εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς Arist. EN 1097b33. Aristotle seems to suggest some kind of difference between "existence" and "life", using (EN 1170b) τὸ εἶναι for the former and τὸ ζῆν for the latter. This may be explicable in terms of his definition of "life" found earlier in the same work, (1170a): "Life is defined in the case of animals by the capacity for sensation, in the case of man, by the capacity for sensation and thought". The second main use of ζάω (as equivalent to βίωω) means "to pass one's life". As examples we may refer to Od. 15.491 ζῶεις δ' ἀγαθὸν βίον and Soph.El.599 ζῶ βίον μοχθηρόν.

Liddell and Scott draw attention to an uncommon use of the verb, with the pregnant sense "to live fully or in the fullest sense". For instance, Xen. Memor. 3.3.11 speaks of "excellent principles (καλλίστα) δι' ὧν ζῆν

<sup>1</sup> This sense belongs generally to βίος. Cf. TWNT, II, p.836, "βίος bezeichnet die Lebensweise, den Charakter, und ist mit ἦθος nahe verwandt".



ἐπιστάμεθα " where there is undoubtedly the suggestion of higher living: this may also be present in Isoc. Paneg.27 which mentions the foundation of a city δι' ἣν ζῆν δυνάμεθα i.e. in which we may be able to (really) live. Again, Dio Cassius relates how Similis was promoted by Trajan to the command of the guards, but finding the post wearisome, resigned and spent the last seven years of his life privately: his epitaph is - Σίμιλις μὲν ἐνταῦθα κεῖται , βίους μὲν ἔτη τοσα, ζήσας δὲ ἔτη ἑπτα (69. 19.) i.e. "here lies Similis, having lived so many years, but having really lived seven years". Menander also appears to have made use of the word in a similar sense (if a fragment from the Πλοκίον has been rightly completed by Seneca, who quotes it), "It is but a small part of life ( βίος ) wherein we really live ( ζῶμεν )". The verb βιώω does not seem to have developed any comparable 'high' sense.

It is frequently assumed, particularly in discussions of NT usage,<sup>1</sup> that the ethical and qualitative idea commonly associated with βίος in Classical Greek was transferred in the sacred literature to ζωή , but was not present in the Classical use of ζωή . This assumption is not strictly accurate. A frequent use of βίος suggests that as well as meaning "manner of living" it could also mean "period or term of life", e.g. ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολέειν Od.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p.274.



18.254; βίον διάγαγειν Aristoph.Pax 439; βίον διατελείν Isoc.6.45; βίον τελευτᾶν Pl. Leg.870e, Isoc.4.84; β. τελεῖν Soph.Ant.1114; διὰ βίου Aris.Pol.1272a37 (= through one's life). This may be the basic meaning of the word. Its ethical connotation depends on the context and particularly on adjectives qualifying it, e.g. βίος τελείος (mature life, Ar.EN 1098a18), ἥδους βίος (ibid. 1169b26), ὁ κατὰ τὸν κῶν β. (1178a) and ἀγαθὸς β. (Od.15:491) etc.<sup>1</sup> But the same may be said of βιωή. Arist.EN 1170a23 mentions μοχθηρὰ βιωή καὶ διεφθαρμένη i.e. "vicious and corrupt life": and a notable passage from Plato (Rep.521a) says, "If you can discover a better way of life (βίος) than holding office for your future rulers, a well-governed city becomes a possibility: for only in such a state will those rule who are really rich, not in gold, but in that wealth which makes happiness, namely a wise and virtuous life (βιωῆς ἀγαθῆς τε καὶ ἑμφρονος)". Again a qualitative suggestion is present in μακαρία βιωή, a phrase by which Plato (Leg. 713c) recalls the Life of the Golden Age. This use of βιωή may be infrequent in classical literature, but it nevertheless does show that an ethical and qualitative connotation was not associated solely with the word βίος.

I It would seem that in fact βίος never refers to the character of life without a qualifying adjective.



### III. The Usage of the Septuagint.

There is not much of significance to report here. Of the 149 appearances of the noun  $\square' \cdot \square$  in the Old Testament, 130 are translated by  $\xi\omega\eta$  and 10 by the verb  $\xi\eta\nu$ . In three of the remaining nine all reference to "life" is missing in the LXX, and the other six use terms related to  $\xi\omega\eta$ . For instance at Prov.31:12  $\square' \cdot \square \cdot \square$  is rendered by  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ , although at that point A S  $\odot$  have the literal form  $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota$   $\tau\eta\varsigma \xi\omega\eta\varsigma$ . At Prov.4:10  $\square' \cdot \square \cdot \square$   $\square\iota\iota\psi$  ("years of life") becomes  $\omicron\delta\omicron\iota \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>1</sup> In connection with these verses it is of interest to note that in Proverbs the "term of life" is rendered by  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ , the common word in Classical literature for "lifetime". In fact the use of the noun  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  (translating Heb.  $\square' \cdot \square$ ) and the verb  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\omega$  belongs almost exclusively to Job and Proverbs in the Canon<sup>2</sup> - books whose Greek translators were sensitive to Greek style and usage.<sup>3</sup> On two occasions the noun  $\square' \cdot \square$  (and on two occasions also the verb  $\square' \cdot \square$ ) is translated by  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , the usual word for  $\psi\chi$ . At Ps.64:1  $\square' \cdot \square \cdot \square$   $\square\lambda\cdot\cdot$  "preserve my life", is rendered by  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$

1 The presence of  $\omicron\delta\omicron\iota$  is due either to a misreading of the Heb. or to the presence of  $\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in the following verse.

2 The words are found also in Sirach, Wisdom and 2,3,4 Maccabees. "Jedenfalls hat LXX als Übersetzung die alte Unterscheidung zwischen  $\xi\omega\eta$  als der vita qua vivimus und  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  als der vita quam vivimus wenigstens insofern aufrechterhalten, als  $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  11 mal im Buche Hiob und 2 mal in Prov. Wiedergabe von  $\square' \cdot \square$  im Sinne von Lebensdauer ist.." TWNT, II, p.853.

3 Cf. G. Gerleman, Studies in the Septuagint: Job (Lund, 1946) and Proverbs (Lund, 1956).



τὴν ψυχὴν μου , and at Job 33:30 חַיִּים is translated with ψυχὴ but in B, S<sub>1</sub> with ζωή . In Ps. 74:19 and in Job 33:28 the verb חַיִּים is rendered by ψυχὴ , while at Job. 38:39 the phrase חַיִּים צִדְּקֵי לֵוִי (which must mean the "living souls of young lions" or "appetites of young lions") is translated by ψυχὰς ὑπακούοντων . These readings reflect the interpretation of חַיִּים in terms of the life of a person (i.e. חַיִּים ) rather than of general "aliveness".

When we inquire what other words are translated by ζωή in the LXX there is nothing of importance to record. Once (Job 7:1) it renders חַיִּים: twice (Prov. 23:3; 27:27) it represents חַיִּים , a translation which recalls the ancient classical use of ζωή to mean "substance, or means of sustaining life". At Prov. 18:4 חַיִּים קָצִיר appears in the LXX as πηγὴ ζωῆς: for חַיִּים - קָצִיר (usually rendered as "reap the fruit of steadfast love") the LXX has τρυγῆσαι εἰς κάππον ζωῆς (Hos. 10:12). It would be difficult to explain satisfactorily these varied Septuagintal readings, assuming they are not due to simple error, but we may spare ourselves the attempt by reason of the infrequency of their occurrence and the consequent unlikelihood of their having affected the background of the NT term ζωή : the word generally corresponds to the Hebrew חַיִּים , even when the latter possesses the full and pregnant sense of "real life" achieved through obedience and fellowship with God.



At Is.26:19 the phrase  $\eta\eta' \eta' \eta'$  ("thy dead shall live") is translated in the LXX by  $\text{οι νεκροι ἀναστή- σονται}$ , the verb  $\text{ἀνίστημι}$  being specially associated with resurrection into life. The later translators - Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion - all render  $\eta\eta' \eta'$  here by  $\text{ζήσονται}$ . In the important "resurrection" passage (Dan. 12:2) the first mention of the "eternal life" of the pious is rendered in the LXX as  $\text{eis ζωὴν αἰώνιον}$ , the only place in the canonical OT scriptures where this conjunction of noun and adjective occurs. The adjective  $\text{αἰώνιος}$  first appears in Plato, and from that period onwards it is used to mean "enduring for an indefinitely long time, perpetual, eternal": bearing this meaning, it would appear to be a satisfactory rendering of the Hebrew  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ .<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. The Inter-Testamental Literature

When we pass to the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings (both Hellenistic and Palestinian) we find most of the uses of  $\text{ζωή}$  already noticed still present. The word is very frequently used to mean "period, span or days of life", and the continuance of life is considered as good (Tob.8:17).<sup>2</sup> The ideas associated with the word are basically those of I See p. 319f. for remarks on the meaning of  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ .

<sup>2</sup>  $\text{ζωή}$ , like  $\text{βίος}$ , may be used to mean "a man's living", Sir. 4:1; 31:25f). Both words can bear this meaning in Classical Greek.



the Old Testament. The commands of God are the commands of life (Bar.3:9), while length of days and life are associated with the learning of wisdom (Bar.3:14). Life (with stress on the physical aspect) is regarded as a recompense for righteousness: "They that do alms and righteousness shall be filled with life" (Tob.12:9), and "The righteous shall remain in the fruitful earth as God has given them spirit and life and grace" (Sib.Or.4:45. cf. Enoch 5:9).

In this literature, however, there comes into greater prominence what we may call the conception of eschatological life. In the pre-Christian Psalms of Solomon we read (3:16), "they that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal (ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) and their life (ἡ ζωὴ αὐτῶν) shall be in the light of the Lord and shall come to an end no more": 13:9 "the life (ζωή) of the righteous shall be forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) but sinners shall be taken away into destruction": and 14:7 "the saints of the Lord shall inherit life (κληρονομήσουσι ζωὴν) in gladness".<sup>1</sup> Slav. Enoch 50:2 declares that "those who spend their days in patience and meekness will inherit eternal life (or the endless age to come)": cf. 65:8. Sib.Or. proem. 84-5 states that "those who reverence the true and everlasting God inherit life throughout the aeonian time,

<sup>1</sup> The two passages 3:16 and 13:9 suggest a contact with Dan. 12:2 and point to the idea expressed there. Some other passages of the Psalms (e.g. 9:9) may refer to eschatological life, but their interpretation is uncertain.



dwelling in the fertile garden of Paradise", and Ap.Bar.42:7 (1st cent.A.D.) that "corruption shall take those who belong to it, and life those who belong to it". In Fourth Ezra vita and vivere are the usual words to express participation in salvation (7:21,48,82,112,137).

Considerable interest attaches to the eschatological outlook of the (Ethiopian) Book of Enoch. At 37:4 Enoch claims that "the lot of eternal life"<sup>1</sup> has been given to him by the Lord of Spirits, and in his third Similitude he declares that "the righteous will be in the light of the sun and the elect in the light of eternal life: there will be no end to the days of their life" (58:3, cf.91:10, 103:4). The blessed righteous and elect dwell in a garden (60:8), called the "Garden of life" (61:12), located, according to 70:3-4, between the North and West, and, according to 77:3, at the furthest extremity of the quarter of the earth called North.<sup>2</sup> Most of these passages are found in the Similitudes section of Enoch and the fact that no fragments of these chapters have been found at Qumran creates a strong impression that they may be of later (even post-Christian) origin. But ch.77 (which locates the garden of righteousness in the

<sup>1</sup> At Enoch 10:10 *ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is used of long life, where an ultimate termination is expected (after 500 years).

<sup>2</sup> A full study of these geographical details has been made by P. Grelot, "La Géographie Mythique d'Hénoch et ses Sources Orientales" and J.T. Milik, "Hénoch au pays des aromates", RB, LXV, (1958), pp.33ff and 70ff. Grelot offers the concentric circle explanation of 70:3.



North) has been discovered in Aramaic fragments which contain the words  $\chi\upsilon\psi\omicron\pi$   $\delta[\eta\eta\eta]$  "the paradise of righteousness"<sup>1</sup> and a strong case can be made for the antiquity of ch.70-1.<sup>2</sup> We have therefore probably two pre-Christian Jewish passages in 1 Enoch testifying to the belief that the righteous and elect live eternally in a paradise "in the North".<sup>3</sup>

The Hellenistic-Jewish books of Maccabees frequently express the certainty of a life beyond death. As he dies, the second of the seven martyred brothers says, "The King of the Universe will raise us up to everlasting life because we have died for his laws ( $\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu\iota\alpha\nu\ \acute{\lambda}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota\nu\ \beta\omega\eta\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\lambda}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ )", 2 Mac.7:19: at v.14 the fourth brother exclaims to the tyrant,  $\sigma\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\lambda}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \beta\omega\eta\acute{\nu}\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  : and at v.36 the youngest of the martyrs claims that "our brothers are under the covenant

<sup>1</sup> See Milik, op.cit., p.76.

<sup>2</sup> M.Black, JTS (n.s.), III (1952) pp.4-10 claims that these chaps. represent an older Son of Man-Enoch tradition, integral to 1 Enoch, "out of which the Similitudes have grown, by a rewriting of the Enoch legend in support of a doctrine of a supernatural Messiah, foreign to the original conception of 1 Enoch".

<sup>3</sup> Milik (op.cit., p.77 n.1) offers as a reason for the popularity in Qumran of the Enoch writings the fact that in them the question "Where is Paradise?" is answered, namely in the North. He goes on to suggest that the north-south orientation of the Qumran graves (the head at the south-end) was governed by the wish that at the general Resurrection the Covenanters would rise to face North and then proceed towards the Paradise.



of God for everlasting life (ἀενάου ζωῆς ὑπὸ διαθήκην Θεοῦ)". 4 Mac. 15:3 says of the mother of the martyrs, "She loved religion (εὐσεβεία) which preserves to eternal life according to God's promise (τὴν σώζουσαν εἰς αἰώνιον ζωὴν κατὰ Θεοῦ)". The idea of the restoration of life and breath (or spirit) to the dead is expressed at 2 Mac. 7:23 and 14:46.

The formulation of ideas of this kind may be regarded as the response to the tragic loss of Hebrew manhood in the Maccabean persecutions. It is a response, however, which, whatever foreign influences contributed to it, is true to essential OT religious insights in its emphasis upon the lasting worth of righteous living. The preservation of this theme as the basis of the future hope may be seen in such passages as Ps. Sol. 13:9: "The life of the righteous shall endure for ever"; Wisdom 3:2-4, "In the eyes of the foolish they (the righteous) seem to have died, and their departure was reckoned as a misery, . . . but they are in peace. For even if they were punished according to the view of men, their hope was full of immortality (ἀθάνασία)" and, in summary, 1:15 "Righteousness is immortal (ἀθάνατος)"<sup>1</sup> cf. Apoc. Bar. 14:3.

When we ask if the Intertestamental writings offer any explanation of the enduring life, we can only find

<sup>1</sup> The continuance of life as a result of righteousness recalls the teaching of Ps. 73.



hints in such passages as Slav. Enoch 30:8 and Wisdom 2: 23-24 ("God created man for incorruption, ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, and made him an image of his own proper essence, τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος ") which imply an original immortal feature in man which, in the case of the righteous, is the pledge<sup>1</sup> of immortality.

#### V. Philo Judaeus

In the writings of Philo the term ζωή is used in the general sense of the "life" of animals and men: Spec, Leg.III, 198, 201; Virt.143; Mut.223; Congr.33; Som.I, 20. God is the author of life (ζωὴς δὲ θεὸς αἴτιος ): Opif.30; Aet.106; He is the eternal fount of life (Fug.198): the divine breath makes alive (Leg.All.I, 32.).

The term is used in the more particular sense of "mortal life" as opposed to θάνατος : cf. Heres 209 where ζωή and θάνατος are plainly antithetical. Whereas death is an evil, life is a good - τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡ ἀρετὴ ἐστὶ ἡ ζωή - Fug.58. That "life" may vary in quality and worth is shown by Fug.55:

Skepsis (or consideration) told me that some people are dead while living ( ζῶντες ) and some alive ( ζῶσι ) while dead; she told me that bad people, prolonging their days to extreme old age are dead men, deprived of the life in association with virtue ( τὸν μετ' ἀρετῆς βίον ), while good people,

<sup>1</sup> The "death which entered the world by the envy of the devil" (v.25) refers to spiritual death, not physical. Both the righteous and the evil experience the latter: the evil must endure the former, while the righteous enter life.



even if cut off from their partnership with the body, live for ever (  $\xi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  ) and are granted immortality (  $\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\omicron\iota\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  ).

The importance of the quality and character of "life" is underlined as this passage continues. On Deut.4:4, "Ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God are alive (  $\xi\eta\tau\epsilon$  ) all of you at this day", Philo comments: "only those who have taken refuge in God and become his suppliants does Moses recognise as living (  $\xi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  ), accounting the rest to be dead men", and he adds that "alive today" permits him to postulate immortality, since "today" is the limitless endless age (57). This real life (  $\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\eta\ \xi\omega\eta$  ) was obtainable from the "tree of life" (i.e. wisdom) but was not accepted by man who chose instead misery. (Log.All.III 52). What was this  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\eta\ \xi\omega\eta$  ?

We must here take notice of this distinction made by Philo between the life of the body and the life of the soul or of reason. There are two kinds of men: those who live by reason, the divine in-breathing, and those who live by blood and the pleasure of the flesh: (Heres 56). The blood-life or life of sensation (  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\theta\eta\tau\eta$   $\xi\omega\eta$  ) is opposed to the life of mind and reason (60ff.). The former finds its material, so to speak, in the physical organisation,<sup>1</sup> and is irrational: only the subordination of it to the divine element, which is reason, can produce life. This life is elsewhere (Abr.) called  $\eta\ \mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \xi\omega\eta$  .



that is true life. An attempted blend of Platonic, Stoic and Aristotelian conceptions enables Philo to claim that life in accordance with reason (which is the divinely inbreathed gift) is the real life of man: ὁπῶς ζῆν means ζῶν κατὰ νοῦν ,<sup>1</sup> Deter.84. Since reason, however, enables us to be indifferent to the so-called bodily and external interests and to be superior to the allurements of passion, it is the fountain of all virtue: hence to live rationally is to live virtuously (ἀρετῇ). For Philo the most generic virtue is called goodness (ἀγαθότης):<sup>2</sup> this parts itself into the four cardinal virtues - prudence, fortitude, temperance and justice. To these Philo sometimes adds piety (εὐσέβεια) and holiness (ὁσιότης), two qualities which the Jew could not dispense with, but which, by their inclusive character, could not be classed under any of the other virtues. Occasionally, and in accordance with the genius of the Hebrew mind, piety (including justice and

<sup>1</sup> Among the descriptions of man's life (ζωή) found in Philo are ἄλυστος καὶ ἄφοβος (Praem.35), μακαρία καὶ εὐδαιμῶν (Exsec. 122), καθάριος (Spec. Leg.4), ἐν θεῷ (Fug.61), ἡ ἀρετῆς ζ. (Heres 292). βίος is used with many descriptive adjectives also, e.g. ἀλήθης, ἀκίνδυνος, αἰσχιστός, εὐδαιμῶν, γαλήνιος and even ἁθάνατος. In fact Philo does not seem to distinguish βίος and ζωή.

<sup>2</sup> This is represented by the river which watered Paradise and flows out of the Wisdom of God. It is therefore, in a sense, identical with the sacred Logos, in conformity with which it has been made. As the river is said to have parted into four great streams or dominions, so goodness divides into the four great virtues. Cf. J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus (London, 1888), vol.2, p.315. For much of this paragraph I am indebted to this work, especially pp.314-16.



philanthropy) assumes the leading place and all the other virtues follow in its train. It requires us to love God as benefactor,<sup>1</sup> to fear him as Lord, to serve him and keep his commandments. To do this is real life. Commenting on Lev. 18:1-5, "You shall keep my statutes and ordinances, by doing which a man shall live", Philo says (Cong.87), "ἡ πρὸς ἀλή-  
θειαν ζωὴ περιπατοῦντος ἐστὶ ἐν ταῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεσι καὶ  
προστέλλεσθαι, ὥστε θάνατος ἂν εἴη τὰ τῶν ἀθέων ἐπιτηδεύματα".

We may fairly claim, then, that for Philo, life according to reason, the life of virtue and the life of piety and holiness are essentially the same in character and manifestation. As their source and support is one, namely the Logos,<sup>2</sup> so also do they share in one fulfilment, namely ἀθανασία.<sup>3</sup> The rational soul or mind is incorruptible and immortal:<sup>4</sup> created man, inspired by the divine πνεῦμα, which

1 The element of love in man's approach to God is strongly emphasised by Philo. "This is the most noble definition of endless life (ἀθάνατος βίος), to be possessed by a love of God with which flesh and body have no concern" (Pug.58).

2 The Logos, as God's Thought or Reason, is "imaged" in human reason, and "each rule of conduct which we can treat as an injunction of reason, is itself a Logos, one of those innumerable thoughts or laws into which the universal thought may, through self-reflection, be resolved" (Drummond, op.cit. p.273) The universal Logos finds partial expression in various Logoi, identified with divine ethical ideas, by which the soul ought to be governed.

3 Throughout his writings Philo speaks of immortality rather than of resurrection of the body. References to the latter doctrine in the traditional literature were understood as figurative means of referring to immortality. Cf. H.A. Wolfson, Philo, (Harvard U.P. 1947) vol.1, p.404.

4 Prob. 46 and Congr. 97.



is the essence of the power of this rational principle, does not differ, when placed in the paradise of virtues (Eden), from the tree that brings forth deathless life (Plant 44),<sup>1</sup> since both are imperishable. The life of the body is, as we have already pointed out, in opposition to the life of the mind, but the eternal possibilities in the latter are illustrated by Oig.14 which speaks of those who study to die to the life in the body (τὸν μετὰ σώματων βίον) in order that a higher existence, immortal and incorporeal, may be their portion (παρὰ τῷ ἀγέννητῳ καὶ ἀφθαρτῷ ζωῇ μεταλλάξωσιν). Reason leads to virtue which is the path to immortal life. Plant.37: the plants of life, immortality and knowledge will not grow in the barren soul, but in the reasonable soul (λογικῇ ψυχῇ) whose path towards virtue has, as its end, life and immortality (ἡ μὲν πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὁδὸς αὐτῆς ζωὴν καὶ ἀθανασίαν ἔχουσα τὸ τέλος). The God, who loves to give, plants in the soul a kind of paradise of virtues and of the deeds which accord with them, which brings it to perfect bliss. The life of virtue is, for the Jew, essentially the life of piety and holiness, and the fruit of these is imperishable life: Opif. 155 εὐσεβεία καὶ ὁσιότης ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἀθάνατος ζωὴ περιγίνεται. Death with the pious is preferable to life with the impious, for ἀθάνατος ζωὴ is the reward of those who die thus, but

1. ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα Θεοῦ χαραχθεὶς πνεύματι οὐδὲν διαφέρει τοῦ τὴν ἀθάνατον ζωὴν καταφοροῦντος δένδρου.



for those who live thus, αἰώνιος θάνατος waits, Post. 39. Since this piety will manifest itself in obedience to the commands of God, it is not surprising that Philo suggests that righteous conduct here and now has within it the seeds of immortal life.<sup>1</sup> Commenting on the promise of the Fifth commandment (".. that thy days may be long upon the land,") he says (Spec. Leg. II, 262), "It offers deathlessness given by a prolonged vitality and a long life (ἀθανασίαν διὰ πολυχρονίου ζωῆς καὶ βίου μακράϊωνος ) which thou wilt keep nourishing, even while in the body, if thou live with a soul purged clean of all impurity (ὅν καὶ μετὰ σώματος θρέψῃς ψυχῇ κεκαθαρμένῃ τελειᾷ καθάρσει βιών )".

We have already drawn attention to the fact that reason, virtue and piety are united in their source, the Divine Logos. Now we may end this section by commenting on a passage which suggests that the same Logos is the ultimate source of the eternal life promised as their reward. In expounding the meaning of the "cities of refuge" in which suppliants might save their lives, Philo declares (Fug. 75) "Is not life eternal to take refuge with Him who is? (οὐ ζωὴ μὲν ἐστὶ αἰώνιος ἢ πρὸς τὸ ὅν καταφύγη;) <sup>2</sup> The explanation

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. von Hugel, Eternal Life (Edinburgh, 1913) p. 52, writing of Philo, points out that, since God is the fount of reason, a reasonable life is a life of God, and adds "Indeed this divine life, even as a man can begin to live it here by a holy life, and still more as, after such a life, he will live it in the Beyond, is sometimes characterised as strictly eternal".

<sup>2</sup> This is the only occurrence of ζωὴ αἰώνιος in Philo.



of this follows: the six cities correspond to six divine powers, but the chief of them is the divine Logos. "The swiftest runner (fleeing from involuntary faults) must urge his breathless course to the highest divine Logos, the fountain of wisdom, that he may draw thence, instead of death, eternal life" (αἰδῖος ζωή) (Fug.94). Thus the various aspects of the Philonic teaching on immortality, like most of his characteristic teachings, find their synthesis in his comprehensive doctrine of the Logos.

#### VI. The Hermetic Literature

In the Hermetic writings - which illustrate a type of religious thought akin to some aspects of Johannine thought<sup>1</sup> - we find the word ζωή used in the sense of life as a comprehensive and meaningful activity: Corp.Her.XI,14, ζωή ἔστι ἔνωσις νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς and I,6 where ζωή is regarded as the union (ἔνωσις) of νοῦς and λόγος, the offspring or image of νοῦς (i.e. God). The two-fold significance of this is explained as follows by C.H. Dodd:

The creative Word is the offspring of the eternal Mind, just as articulate thought and speech in us are the offspring of the human mind; not that these are to be thought of, in either case, as separate entities; life, as a concrete activity, depends on their unity. For a mind not expressing itself is not really alive, and speech which is not the expressed thought of a permanent rational personality,

<sup>1</sup> The writings were produced in Egypt for the most part in the second and third centuries A.D.



is vox et praeterea nihil. Similarly, this living universe is such only as it is the expression of the eternal Mind.

1

At I,9 (Poimandres) the Primal God (Noûs) is described as being ζωὴ καὶ φῶς (cf. XIII, 18-19) and Dodd suggests the influence of OT symbolism from Ps. 36:9, "with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light shall we see light".<sup>2</sup> Philo also draws attention to the presence of these two ideas at the beginning of the Creation story (Opif. 30) and so jointly witnesses to the fact that the doctrine that the union of "light" and "life" gives the most satisfactory account of God in his creative aspect was well established in the Christian era, where Jewish and Hellenistic thought met in an Egyptian environment. The archetypal man (οὐσιώδης ἄνθρωπος) shares the same attributes. He was originally of the substance of the Father (i.e. life and light) and became "from life and light, soul and mind; from life, soul and from light, mind (ὁ δὲ Ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν καὶ νοῦν, ἐκ μὲν ζωῆς εἰς ψυχὴν, ἐκ δὲ φωτὸς εἰς νοῦν ), I, 17."<sup>3</sup> In

1 The Bible and the Greeks, p. 119. Cf. Corpus Hermeticum, ed. Nock et Festugière, (Paris, 1945) vol. 1, p. 18, "Nous et Logos divins existant à la fois et dans le monde archétype et dans chacun de nous, et comportant les mêmes relations dans les deux cas, on explique les rapports de filiation de Logos à Nous en Dieu par la dépendance du Logos à l'égard de l'Intellect en nous". See XII, 8-9 and XVIII, 14 on the presence of Father Nous in us.

2 The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge, 1953) p. 19.

3 There is here probably an echo of Gen. 2:7. The doctrine of both writers is that the life which is in God is manifested



Tractate XII the world is described as πλήρωμα τῆς ζωῆς (13) and there we find the remarkable statement, "As heaven, water, earth and air are parts of the world, so life and immortality. . . are parts of God (ὡςπερ τοῦ κόσμου μέρη ἐστὶ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆ καὶ ἀήρ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον μέρη ἐστὶ <Θεοῦ> ζωὴ καὶ ἀθανασία ,21)" which Dodd interprets as meaning that "as God is manifestly the cause of physical life in the world, so we can look to Him for life everlasting".<sup>1</sup> To describe the life after death, the usual word in the Hermetic literature is ἀθανασία, but ζωὴ is used for the divine life into which man may enter either here and now or after death. The 21st chapter of Tractate I suggests that the way for an individual to regain the immortality which belongs to Essential Man is to know his origin.

The God and Father of whom man came is life and light. If therefore you hear that you are of light and life, and believe (πιστεύῃς) that you are of these, you will enter into life again (εἰς ζωὴν πάλιν χωρήσεις).

In other words, to know God and one's origin in the eternal God is to be immortal.<sup>2</sup> The passage into life is described as an ascent (ἀνοδος) corresponding to man's primal Fall.

In man as the "soul". Cf. Philo Leg. All. I, 32. The Hermetic author adds that the light - which is the other aspect of the divine nature - appears in man as "mind".

1 Dodd, op.cit., p.18.

2 Cf. C.Her.IV,5; also Philo Spec.Leg.I,345.



On this journey man is purified from his passions and at last experiences communion with God. Thus we read in Poimandres 32, "I believe and testify: I enter into light and life. Blessed art Thou, O Father. (πιστεύω<sup>1</sup> καὶ μαρτυρῶ. εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς χωρῶ. εὐλογητὸς εἶ πάτερ)". The spiritual and mystical awareness of the truth is at the same time an entrance into life and light, a union with God, and it apparently takes place in this life.

Zωή<sup>1</sup> is used of ordinary physical life where the name of Adam's wife is called Ζωή<sup>2</sup>, life. "Life" allured man to love her and so brought him low by affording indulgence for his love of material nature. Here ζωή is clearly not the transcendental life which is an aspect of God: rather it is physical existence.

The writings of Philo represent what may be called an early Jewish gnosticising type of thought which uses pagan religious thought to elucidate the Jewish scriptures. The Hermetic writings, on the other hand, represent a fuller and more developed Gnosticism where the Jewish scriptures become the handmaid of philosophy. It

1 This "faith" is hardly distinguishable from the γνῶσις through which one attains immortality.

2 The name Eve in Hebrew חַוָּה resembles the word for "life"; "the man called his wife חַוָּה because she was חַיָּה-בָּרָא, the mother of all living", Gen.3:20. The LXX renders the name by Ζωή. Speculation on the name was lively: Ζωή is sent to help and support Adam, in the Apocryphen of John: cf. also Philo Heres 53.



becomes clear from our brief discussions of these works (leaving aside the developed Gnostic systems of Basilides and Valentinus) that they represent life as possible on two levels, that of ordinary animal existence, the merely physical plane, and that of mind (cf. C. Her. XII, 1-3), of awareness of one's true nature and origin, which is knowledge. All men possess the divine element of the potential life, but only some achieve salvation and  $\alpha\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha$ . This is attained, not by the redemption and transformation of the whole man, but by the release of the divine nature which is fettered within the lower levels of existence, a release which is made possible by the imparting of  $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . Dr. F. Mussner sums the matter up well when he says that "Gnostic redemption does not bring life as a divine gift but is the drawing back again of the separated sparks of life into transcendent heavenly unity (Lebenszusammenhang) in which they are freed from cosmic forces".<sup>1</sup> The question whether in the concept of Life in the Fourth Gospel "the transcendental form of the Gnostic myth comes to the fore must be answered in the negative, although there are many formal and terminological points of contact between John and Gnosis."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mussner, ZΩH - Die Anschauung vom 'Leben' im vierten Evangelium, (München, 1952) p. 186., See Dodd, op.cit., Part I, chap. 5, p. 97ff. A Feuillet, Etudes Johanniques (Bruges, 1962) pp. 176ff also criticises those who interpret the Johannine teaching in terms of Hellenistic mysticism.

<sup>2</sup> Mussner, loc.cit.



## VII. The Rabbinic Literature

It has been pointed out that the phrase "eternal life", חַיִּי  
 חַיִּי first appears at Dan.12:2 to describe the reward  
 of the righteous, and that the same idea finds expression  
 in various works of Palestinian Judaism. When we turn to  
 the writings of Rabbinic Judaism we find the phrase חַיִּי עֲלָמָא  
 appearing in the Targumim where the OT speaks simply of  
 "life". At Lev.18:5 the M.T. says of the commandments and  
 judgements of Yahweh - אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה אִתְּם הָאֲדָמָה וְחַיִּי בָהֶם - to  
 which both Pseudo-Jonathan and T.Onkelos add בְּחַיִּי עֲלָמָא,  
 the former continuing "and his portion shall be with the  
 just". Again at Deut. 33:6, for the M.T. יְחִי רְאוּבֵן וְאֶל-יְמֹתָי  
 Ps. Jonathan reads יְחִי ר' בְּחַיִּי עֲלָמָא and Onkelos יְחִי ר' בְּחַיִּי עֲלָמָא  
 adding "and not die the second death". Here, and at Ezek.  
 20:11,13,21 where Ps. Jonathan translates the חַיִּי of the  
 M.T. by חַיִּי בְּחַיִּי עֲלָמָא, it seems clear that the meaning  
 intended is "eternal life". Judaism has found reference to  
 the idea of a future life where the OT appears to have con-  
 fined its hope to the blessing of longevity and well-being  
 through obedience to God.

In the Talmud חַיִּי עֲלָמָא is used occasionally in  
 antithesis to חַיִּי שָׂעָה "temporary or ephemeral life". The  
 earliest example of this seems to be the criticism by  
 Eliezer (90-100 A.D.) at b.Bes.15b of those who put aside  
 the eternal life (חַיִּי עֲלָמָא) and occupy themselves



with the transitory life (  $\text{עוֹלָם בְּיָמֵינוּ}$  ). The same contrast is imputed to Simeon ben Jochai (c.150 A.D.) at b.Shab.33b and to Simeon ben Gamaliel (c.140 A.D.) in jer. Moed qat. 82b. Here the emphasis lies on the duration of the life (and perhaps also on the quality) and we might even translate as "everlasting life".

Along with the use of  $\text{עוֹלָם בְּיָמֵינוּ}$  as the correlative of  $\text{עוֹלָם בְּיָמֵינוּ}$ , there arose a different usage which distinguished two  $\text{עוֹלָם בְּיָמֵינוּ}$ , "this Age" and "the Age to come". The doctrine of the two ages is found in developed form in 4th Ezra (100 A.D.) but there appear to be references to it in the Book of Enoch, in chapters 48 and 71; and it is implied in the language of Paul, the Synoptic Gospels and Hebrews. The general distinction between the two ages has often been described and here we need only refer to the treatment of the subject in Strack-Billerbeck,<sup>1</sup> Bonsirven<sup>2</sup> and G.F. Moore,<sup>3</sup> while drawing attention to three significant points. First, the doctrine evidently arose in apocalyptic circles. Secondly, while it was undoubtedly well-known to the Rabbis, references to it are scarce and not always certain in rabbinic sayings before the end of the first Christian century. If the addition to a saying

I SB, vol.4, pp.799ff.

<sup>2</sup> Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ, (Paris, 1934-35) vol.1, p.307ff.

<sup>3</sup> Judaism, (Oxford, 1927-30), vol.2.



of Hillel given in P.Aboth 2.7 is genuine, then Hillel would be the earliest witness to the use of the expression. The passage reads: "He who acquires for himself the words of the law acquires for himself the life of the Age to come (קָנָה לוֹ חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם אֲבָרָה)". A second witness is found in Johanan ben Zacai (c.80 A.D.) who declares that God revealed to Abraham "this age (הָאֵלֶּה עוֹלָם הַזֶּה)" but not "the age to come (אֲבָרָה עוֹלָם הָעוֹלָם)", Gen.R.44. In Tos.Peah 4.18 p.24 the proselyte king Monobazus of Adiabene (c.50 A.D.) is made to say: "My father gathered treasure in this age (הָאֵלֶּה עוֹלָם הַזֶּה): I have gathered treasure for (or unto) the Age to come (אֲבָרָה עוֹלָם הָעוֹלָם)". The currency of the expression is thus well established from the end of the first century A.D.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, in the rather confused discussions of Jewish theology concerning the Age to come two lines of thought are present: (i) the Age to come is conceived of as eternally existent: it always is in the heavens and we awake to it at death<sup>2</sup> (1 Enoch 71:15, P.Aboth 4.16) and then experience judgment (b.Ber.28b): (ii) the Age to come is said to come into being after the Messianic age and the general resurrection: the Age to come follows these events.

1 Cf. G. Dalman, Words of Jesus, (Edinburgh, 1902), p.151.

2 Cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.316. SB, Moore and Bonsirven have also pointed this out, as has J.B. Frey, "La Vie de l'au-delà dans les conceptions juives au temps de Jésus-Christ", Biblica, XIII, (1932) pp.135ff.



The examples of this usage are legion and need not be given at this point.<sup>1</sup> It seems that SB wish to find too neat a system in the Rabbinic doctrine when they interpret these two views as referring to a first and a second phase of the world-to-come.<sup>2</sup> In the teaching of Judaism on the 'ôlam ha-bâ there is neither uniformity nor careful system. We must reckon not only with differences of emphasis in the earlier and later rabbis, but also with the continuance of apocalyptic ideas (Enoch 71) as distinct from Rabbinic conceptions. Moreover, the presence of the two views of the Age to come is not inconsistent with what we found in the OT where there is an expectation of immediate entry into everlasting life after death (Psalms) as well as of its delay till after the Resurrection (Is. and Dan.). In fact these two strands of thought probably form the basis of all the strange variety of statement by which Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Judaism expressed their confident hope in the reality of life in the Age to come.

As one would expect within Judaism, the condition of entry into the life of the Age to come is associated with the Torah and obedience. We have already referred to P. Aboth 2.7 ("He who acquires for himself the words of Torah

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Rabbinic Anthology, ed. C. Montefiore and H. Loewe, (London, 1938) chapter 31. Reference is made on p.xlvii and 581 to the variety of opinion on the whole theme.

<sup>2</sup> SB, vol.4, pp.819ff.



acquires for himself the life of the Age to come") and a late gloss to Aboth 6.7 affirms that "Great is the Torah, for to those who practise it it gives life in this world and in the world to come". Likewise Sifre Lev.5.85d (on 18:5): "'Keep it', that means to keep and to do it (the Law) and 'a man shall live' in the Age which is coming". In comparing the Torah to water, Sifre Deut. par.47-8 (p.110) says: "As water brings life to the world, so the Torah brings life to the world. . . The words of Torah give to man life (Prov.25:25)". The Mech.Exod.13.3 ("Torah in which is the life of the Age to come") attributed to R.Ishmael, c.135, and Pesiq. 102b ("The words of Torah which are life in this age and of the age to come"; both bear witness to the same theme. The b.Berak. 28b records that when Eliezer (c.90 A.D.) was sick, his disciples came to him and asked "Teach us the paths of life that by them we may acquire the life of the Age to come ( ונדכה בחן לחיי ) (העולם הבא)" and he answered, "Be solicitous for the honour of your colleagues, keep your children from meditation (philosophy) and set them between the knees of the scholars, and when you pray, know before whom you are standing, and in this way you will win the future world." Consideration for others, concern for the welfare of children, knowledge of and reverence for God mark the pathway towards the sharing in the life of the Age to come.



While the phrase "the life of the Age to come" is common in the latter Jewish literature, the simple term "life" is occasionally used with the same meaning. It should be noticed, however, that it is only when the antithesis "life-death" is implied or expressed that the term is left without qualification.<sup>1</sup> This use of "life" to denote everlasting life beyond the grave is paralleled in Ps. Sol.14.6 and 2 Mac.7:9,14.

By way of summary, we may distinguish within Judaism three main forms of expression: (i) "life" as contrasted with "death"; (ii) "eternal life ( חיי עולם )" as contrasted with the transitory life of time; and (iii) the "life of the age to come" contrasted with the "life of this age". In all three uses there is reference to life beyond the grave.

#### VIII. The Dead Sea Scrolls

The use of the word חַיִּים and related words in the Qumran documents is as follows:

(a) The Manual of Discipline, IQS 1.1: חַיִּים לְחַיִּים] ת[. translated as "... to live according to the rule of the Community". IQS 2.3: The priest's blessing of the righteous: "May He (God) bless thee with every good, keep thee from every evil, illumine thy heart with life-giving wisdom

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dalman, op.cit., pp.159-60 and the examples quoted there.



( בשכל חיים ) and deign to grant thee the knowledge of  
 eternity ( ברעת עולמים ) and lift up his face of mercy  
 towards thee for eternal bliss ( לשלום עולמים ) 1QS 3.1:  
 Whoever does not enter the covenant "has not held fast to the  
 restorer of his life ( לא חזק למשיב חיו )". 1QS 3.6-7: "It is  
 through the spirit of God's true counsel concerning the  
 ways of man that all his iniquities will be atoned so that  
 he may look upon the life-giving light ( להביט באור החיים )".  
 1QS 4.7: those who walk according to the spirit of truth  
 will be rewarded by ". . all everlasting blessings, ever-  
 lasting joy in eternal life ( שמחת עולמים בחיי נצח ) and  
 perfect glory with fulness of splendour in eternal light  
 ( וכליל כבוד עם מדת הדר באור עולמים )"<sup>1</sup>

(b) The War Scroll. 1QM 12.3: "The loving kindnesses of thy  
 blessings and thy covenant of peace thou hast inscribed  
 for them (the elect) in a charter (record) of life ( חרתה  
 למו בחרט חיים )" cf. Exod. 32.4.

(c) The Thanksgiving Hymns. 1QH 2.17(?), 5.6, 8.29(?), 9.6  
 and 9.11 use חיי of the "life of a person". 1QH 7.15:  
 "Thou hast established mine heart. . . in thy truth, to  
 guide my steps in the paths of righteousness, so that I  
 may walk in thy presence in the borders of חיים".<sup>2</sup> 1QH 8.6

<sup>1</sup> Over against the "joy in eternal life" is set "destruction  
 in the fire of dark regions", v.13.

<sup>2</sup> This reading assumes that in the one line, the eradicated  
 חיי should be a dittography of the first word.



gives thanks that God has caused the Psalmist to dwell in a place where grow "trees of life" at the secret well-spring. It is possible that the trees should be interpreted symbolically of the new life of the Covenant which has its secret origin in the revelation of God,<sup>1</sup> but it is more probable that they should be understood as an allegory of the saints themselves, the members of the Sect. This plantation of truth has its fruit protected by God, but the other trees will not be fruitful, since they do not acknowledge (or put faith in) the "fountain of Life" (vs. 12,14). This fountain may be the same as the well spring mentioned in v.6 (i.e. the secret of the Covenanters' life) or it may refer to the Teacher of Righteousness, as Dupont-Sommer has suggested.<sup>2</sup>

(d) The Damascus Document. CD 3. 18-20 speaks thus of the faithful: "God in his wonderful mysteries forgave them their trespass and pardoned their sin. He built them a sure house in Israel. . . They who hold fast to it shall possess eternal life and all the glory of Adam (המחזיקים (בו לחי נצח וכל כבוד אדם)." CD 4.21 describes lust as marrying two women, "each of them being alive (בחיותם)", i.e. in their lifetimes.

<sup>1</sup> S. Holm-Neilsen, Hodayot Psalms from Qumran, (Aarhus, 1960) p.148.

<sup>2</sup> "Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la Mer Morte", Semitica, VII, (1957), p.62.



From this list it is clear that some of the uses of  $\square' \square$  found in the OT reappear in the Qumran documents. The use of the word for a man's life or lifetime is common; and its use in association with "light" and "wisdom" recalls passages from the Sapiential literature, and connotes that light and wisdom by which men truly live. It is remarkable that, unlike the Rabbinic literature, there appears to be no direct association of the Torah and "life" although the Torah played a very significant part in the life of the Sect. Nevertheless, obedience to God and the entry into the Covenant, which will be its result, constitute the path to real life and ensure incorporation in the Book of life. To those who have entered this path, the elect of God, belongs the reward of  $\square \square \square \square$ , CD 3.20, 1QS 4.7.

With this phrase, we turn to the question of the sect's expectation of immortality. Opinions differ on this problem and we cannot enter into it in detail here, but some exposition of it is essential to our argument. A passage of importance in this connection is 1QH 3.19-23:

I give thanks unto thee, O Lord,  
For thou hast delivered my soul from the pit;  
And from Sheol Abaddon thou hast brought me up to the  
summit of the world (to an everlasting height).  
I walked on a plain without bounds:  
And I knew that there is hope for him whom thou hast  
fashioned from dust for the communion of eternity.  
The perverse spirit thou hast cleansed from  
a great transgression,  
To take its place with the host of the holy ones  
(the angels?)



And to enter into fellowship with the company  
of the sons of heaven.  
For thou hast appointed to man eternal lot (destiny)  
with the spirits that have knowledge,  
To praise thy name together with them  
And to recount thy wonders before all thy works.

With this passage in mind, M. Black suggests that "there is no doubt that, as contrasted with Sadducean doctrine, the Zadokites did believe in a doctrine of immortal or eternal life".<sup>1</sup> He thinks that the immortality included both body and soul, thus differing from Dupont-Sommer, who claims that the passage teaches the immortality of the soul alone, in harmony with Josephus' account (B.J. II, 8.11) of the Essenes' hope of the immortality of the soul.<sup>2</sup> R.B. Laurin has taken issue with Black's interpretation and asserts that the passage refers to a deliverance from present distress and suffering into security.<sup>3</sup> He compares the passage with (i) 1QS 6.7-35 which refers to the restored Israel and to those who are associated with "angels of the presence", but on the earthly sphere, and with (ii) 1QSB 4.24b-28 where "the holy dwelling place" in which the priests will share the lot with the "angels of the presence" is located (by Laurin) in the restored Kingdom. Now this latter passage

1 The Scrolls and Christian Origins, (Edinburgh, 1961) pp. 138-9. Also, "Theological Conceptions in the DSS", SEA, XVIII-XIX, (1953-54) p.82.

2 The Dead Sea Scrolls, (Oxford, 1952) p.72. Cf. J. van der Ploeg, "L'Immortalité de l'homme d'après les Textes de la Mer Morte", VT, II, (1952) pp. 171-75.

3 "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'", JSS, III, (1958) pp. 344ff.



may be interpreted as referring to the dwelling-place of God in heaven,<sup>1</sup> rather than to the sanctuary of a restored Jerusalem. If this is so, the sect's doctrine of immortality is the same as that of Luke 20:35ff where, in the resurrection of the dead, men and women become ἰσχυροὶ in heaven. Laurin, however, concludes that the Thanksgiving Hymns do not conceive of immortality for the righteous, either in the body or in the soul.

As we would expect, they used the timeless expressions of the Biblical Psalms but "this is implicit in any real fellowship with God" (H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, 1946, p.118). They caught the spirit of the Psalmist when they looked for fellowship with God to last "forever", yet they remained bound to the belief that one day they would die and that would be the end of it.

2

Doubtless both views will continue to attract adherents, but if we look beyond the Thanksgiving Hymns and especially to the two passages in which the words ׀צ] ׀׀ appear (CD 3.20 and 1QS 4.7) it seems difficult to deny that the sectarians did possess the hope of eternal life. F. Nötscher claims that the words for "eternal" should not be understood eschatologically in this connection, but merely of

<sup>1</sup> Earlier in this study we drew attention to the likelihood that the Qumran covenanters located this paradise of God in the North, following the Enoch tradition which was popular among them. The north-south orientation of the graves at Qumran may be explained on this hypothesis. If it is correct, then we would have irrefutable evidence for the sect's belief in life after death.

2 Laurin, op.cit., p.355.



long duration:<sup>1</sup> but, while it is true that this is a common meaning of  $\square\text{ל} \square$ , it does not exhaust its reference it may also connote infinite prolongation when associated with that which God establishes or gives.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it is probable that we should take the phrase  $\square\text{ל} \square$  to mean life without cessation by death, since, in the two passages where it appears, the context is clearly eschatological. "All the glory of Adam" (and that probably included original deathlessness) will be restored, the splendour and joy of the Beginning will be renewed, in fact, the state of things before the Fall will be restored, and the new obedient mankind will be given life for a thousand generations (CD. 7.5-6) - an expression which, as Black says, "practically means eternal life".<sup>3</sup>

#### IX. The Meaning and Use of $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ .

Before entering upon the detailed discussion of  $\xi\omega\eta$  and  $\xi\omega\eta \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in the New Testament, one important point requires some investigation. It concerns the meaning of the adjective  $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$  . The word first appears in Plato with the meaning "perpetual, enduring for an indefinitely long time" (Rep.363d), "everlasting" (Tim.37,38c; Leg.X,904a). Throughout Classical and later Greek usage it retains this

<sup>1</sup> Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte, (Bonn, 1956), p.157.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time, p.70.

<sup>3</sup> The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p.139.



sense, cf. Diod.Sic.I,1.5. The LXX uses it to translate only  $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$  and cognates which modify such words as  $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$  (Gen.17:1; 1 Chr.16:17),  $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$  (Ex.27:21; Num.10:8) and where it is clear that the adjective retains its classical meaning. The phrase  $\xi\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , so frequent in the NT, occurs only at Dan.12:2, and, as suggested earlier, there is no deviation here from previous usage: indefinite duration is increased to infinite, as a suitable description of that which is divine in origin. Our review of the Inter-testamental literature disclosed that  $\xi\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is found at 4 Mac.15:3 and Ps. Sol.3:16, with similar phrases at 2 Mac.7:9 and 1 Enoch 15:4.6. In these passages also the adjective bears the essentially durative connotation. That there may be a vague qualitative suggestion in the word is probable, but Moulton and Milligan claim that "in general the word depicts that of which the horizon is not in view, whether the horizon be at an infinite distance, or whether it lies no farther than the span of a Caesar's life":<sup>1</sup> this view clearly emphasises the idea of duration in the word.

Now it is well-known that in the discussion of the NT use of  $\xi\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\varsigma$  it is generally assumed that the adjective refers to the "Age to come" and that the phrase means "the life of the Age to come", explicable in terms of the Jewish doctrine of the Two ages. Many years ago E.D.

<sup>1</sup> Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, ad loc.



Burton disputed this<sup>1</sup> and maintained (i) that the force of the adjective is always purely temporal and quantitative, and (ii) that "it has no association with ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος or ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν : it came into existence before these terms were in use and its kinship of meaning is not with them, but with the αἰὼν of Plato, meaning 'for ever'". Now the preceding paragraph of this section is ample proof that the main stream of the usage of αἰώνιος (early and Hellenistic-Jewish) does connote duration. Should we then interpret βωή αἰώνιος in the NT in a temporal manner (i.e. "eternal" = enduring for an indefinitely long time) or are the many commentators correct who, while not denying temporal value to the term, claim that it bears, in addition, a qualitative reference associated with "the age to come", and if so, what is the new factor supporting this interpretation?

In the first place, we must try, even at the risk of some repetition, to assess the approximate date at which the idea of the two ages entered Jewish thought in order to discover whether or not the NT documents were written when such ideas were common.. The doctrine of the two ages is clearly developed in 4th Ezra (c.100 A.D.) and the variation of view in this book as to the time of the beginning of the New Age (cf.6:7-10 and 7:29) suggests

<sup>1</sup> Galatians, ICC, (Edinburgh, 1921) pp.344 and 432. The quotation given is from p.432.



that speculation on the idea of the two ages had been for some time a feature of Jewish thought. C.H. Dodd draws attention to apparent references to the two ages in Enoch 48:17 and 71:15.<sup>1</sup> Both these passages are in the Similitudes section of Enoch and because of the great uncertainty attaching to the dating of this part (many scholars regarding it as post-Christian), it would be unwise to build upon it any argument for the early appearance of the two-ages doctrine. At a number of points in the Apocalypse of Baruch a contrast is made between "this age (Syr.  $\times\text{ܠܒܝ}$   $\times\text{ܢܗ}^2$ )" and "the age that is promised to the pious ( $\times\text{ܠܒܝ}$   $\text{ܪܡܠܟܬܠܗܘܢ}$ ), 14:13: the "age to come" appears alongside "this age" (15:7f; 44:15) and "that endless age" beside "this passing age" (48:50). All these passages, however, come from those parts of the Apocalypse which R.H. Charles dates in the period after the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e. after 70 A.D. Somewhat earlier than this, but still in the first century A.D., the Slavonic Enoch mentions "the future age" or "the endless age" at 56:4 and 61:2. In discussing Rabbinic usage we drew attention to words attributed to R.Hillel (a contemporary of Herod the Great) at P. Aboth 2.7: "He who acquires for himself the words of the law acquires for himself the life of the age to come ( $\text{חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם}$   $\times\text{ܠܗ}$ )". If genuine, this would be the first Rabbinic

<sup>1</sup> Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.145.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from Dalman, Words of Jesus, p.149.



reference to the doctrine, but the authenticity of the ascription is doubted by some. The earliest certain witness to the use of the phrases "this age" and "the age to come" is Johanan ben Zaccai (c.80 A.D.) in Gen.R.44. From this extra-biblical material we may conclude that definite statements concerning the doctrine of the two ages are late: the expressions are current by the end of the first Christian century, but rare and questionable before that time. On the other hand, we must reckon with the possibility that the idea was current before it found clear expression.

On this matter, however, we must admit NT evidence and there it seems clear that the theme of the two Ages was known to Paul. The expression "this age, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος" occurs 7 times in the unquestionably genuine letters (Rom.12:2, 1 Cor.1:20; 2:6 (bis), 2:8, 3:18 and 2 Cor.4:4). In Gal.1:4 there occurs the expression "this present evil age" (ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστὼς πονηρός). Only in Ephesians, among the letters ascribed to Paul, do the two phrases "this age" and "the coming age" occur together (1:21). It may be that in the making of this distinction, the influence of Paul's training in Rabbinic ideas is manifest. The distinction is suggested also at Mt.12:32, Mark 10:30, Luk.16:8 and 18:30.

The distinction between "this age" and "the age to come" was known to the NT writers, although there is little evidence of its expression in the extra-biblical



literature of that period. Now we must go on to ask whether it is likely that the word αἰώνιος was taken over by the NT writers to describe aspects, and in particular the "life", of the coming age. We recall that עולם in the OT was regularly rendered by αἰώνιος when both the Hebrew and the Greek terms connoted "indefinite, or infinite duration": therefore when עולם came to bear the meaning of αἰών (= "definite period of time"),<sup>1</sup> it would be easy for the adjective αἰώνιος to be retained with the corresponding change in meaning, i.e. "of the age", although one must admit that there was nothing in the world to make definite its reference to the "age to come" rather than to "this age". We may go one step further. On analysing certain statements in the Gospels concerning ἡ αἰώνιος, we are confronted with a very close parallelism between them and passages in Jewish writings which include the phrase עולם הבא. For instance, Mt.19:16, Mark 10:17, Luke 18:18 and 10:25 pose the question as to the means of having or inheriting ἡ αἰώνιος. This recalls b.Berak.28b where we are told that when Eliezer (c.90 A.D. ) was ill

<sup>1</sup> On this semantic development Dalman, op.cit., pp.152-3 says: "Contact with Greek modes of thought, moreover, introduced the idea of the αἰών, i.e. "lifetime", "the age" and "the temporary" into the circle of Jewish thought, either directly or through the medium of the Syrians. And when a term corresponding to αἰών was wanted, it would be readily remembered that the Aramaic עולם was equivalent to the Greek εἰς αἰῶνα "for ever", and thence easy to attribute to this עולם the special meanings of the Greek αἰών. Thus עולם became "age".



his disciples came and asked "Teach us the paths of life that by them we may acquire the life of the Age to come"; and in view of the answer of Jesus, we may refer to Sifre Lev.5.85d (on 18:5) which declares that the keeping of the law assures man of life in the age which is coming. The dating of these Rabbinic statements is notoriously difficult and creates great uncertainty as to their usefulness for the elucidation of NT sayings, but the likeness of the ideas expressed suggests a strong possibility that ζωὴ αἰώνιος here means "the life of the Age to come". Similarly, some passages in John's gospel (if we may anticipate our later discussion) seem to contain references to the Jewish doctrine: e.g. Jn.5:39 "Ye search the scriptures because in them ye think ye have ζωὴν αἰώνιον", where ἐρευνᾶν corresponds to שׁוּרר, the technical term for Biblical study and exposition, and where the total meaning recalls P.Aboth 6.7 "Great is Torah for it gives to them that practise it life in this age and in the Age to come": also Jn.4:36 and Tos.Peah 4.18, p.24.<sup>1</sup> Passages such as these in the Gospel reveal the essential Jewishness of John's thought on ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

It would appear to be legitimate and right to interpret ζωὴ αἰώνιος to mean "life of the Age to come". To do so does not mean that the idea of duration is missing. I C.H. Dodd, op.cit., p.146 mentions other passages.



The future Age is brought in and established by God's action, and in so far as it is His Age it is enduring and eternal. Those who experience it share in "life" which is infinitely prolonged. In other words, ζῶν αἰώνιος in the NT, while stressing the qualitative, has inherent in it a temporal reference.

## X. The Use of ζῶν αἰώνιος in the New Testament

### Part 1. Paul.

In many passages Paul uses ζῶν in the straightforward sense of "physical life", "existence" as opposed to "death": Rom. 8:38, Phil.1:20, 1 Cor.3:22. He uses it also of a man's "life" or "lifetime": 1 Cor.15:19 (cf 1 Tim.4:8). The verb is used to mean "be alive" (i.e. not dead) at Rom.14:8, 2 Cor. 1:8, 1 Thes.4:15; to "live a lifetime" at Rom.7:1,2,3; 1 Cor. 7:39; and to "get a living" at 1 Cor.9:14. God is the living God (Rom.9:26, 2 Cor.3:3 and 6:16, 1 Thes.1:9). At Rom.12:1 the Christians are exhorted to present their bodies as θυσία ζῶσα to God, and that means "vital" offerings, with all their powers and faculties alive to the sense and will of God.<sup>1</sup> The word ζῶν is also frequently used in the sense of a future reward or blessing which God will bestow. This may be called the eschatological usage, and in this sense the noun is generally qualified by αἰώνιος. Thus at Rom.2:7

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, (London, 1946) p.159, on the participle of ζῶν used as an adjective. The description of Christ as λίθον ζῶντα at 1 Pet.2:4 means that he is alive and life-giving.



ζωὴ αἰώνιος is the reward of perseverance in well-doing and of the quest for glory and immortality: in Rom.5:21 it is the goal or aim of the reign of grace through Christ, and at Rom.6:22 it expresses the ultimate result (τέλος) of freedom from sin and servitude to God, and is described as the gift of God, in contrast to the wages of sin. At Gal.6:8 the apostle designates by ζωὴ αἰώνιος the harvest reaped ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος by him who sows εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα. These passages suggest that there is a connection between ζωὴ αἰώνιος and that human experience of which it is the culmination. It is not something added on at death or judgment, but is organically related to the quality of the life itself. ζωὴ αἰώνιος may indeed follow judgment at the end of the Age, but it may be introduced before that. "One man's act of righteousness led to acquittal and life (εἰς δικαιώσιν ζωῆς) for all men" (Rom.5:18), and that "life" is, as Sanday and Headlam say, "both the immediate and ultimate result of that state of things into which the Christian enters when he is declared righteous or receives the sentence of absolution".<sup>1</sup> In 1 Tim.6:12 we have a reference to the "eternal life" into which Timothy was called at baptism: cf. also Rom.5:17.

Although Paul regards ζωὴ αἰώνιος as predominantly eschatological, there can be no doubt that he sees "life",  
1 Romans, ICC, (5th ed. Edinburgh, 1902) p.142.



even this "eternal life", as a present possession of the believer. It is the direct result of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and may even be termed the actual and active presence of the Spirit in the human personality. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (i.e. the life-giving spirit) has made me free from the law of sin and of death" (Rom.8:2): the mind of the Spirit is life and peace (Rom. 8:6 and cf.8:10). To have one's attitude determined by the Spirit not only will issue in life, but also has in itself already the germs of life. The new life of the believer is associated also with participation in the death and resurrection of Jesus through baptism.

We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς). For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. ... If we have died with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him. (Rom.6:4f.,8).

It is clear that v.4 represents the new life as a present possibility. Burial with Christ prepares the believer for participation in the potentiality of new life which His resurrection disclosed, so that after the act of belief a new life opens before him. But is the union with Christ's resurrection in v.5 present or future? C.K. Barrett interprets it as futuristic, as in v.8;<sup>1</sup> on the other hand, F.J. Leenhardt regards it as present:

<sup>1</sup> Commentary on Romans, p.123.



Is the future verb chronological or logical? Is it an allusion to the general resurrection, or to the present participation of the believer in the life of the Risen Lord which should flow logically from his participation in the death of the Crucified? The second meaning is preferable both because of the indissoluble unity constituted by the Cross and Resurrection and also because of the parallel thought in Col.2:12, where ideas of death and resurrection are associated with baptism. 1

Furthermore, at v.11, Paul alludes to the new life of the believer in such a way as to make it clear that it is a being-raised in the life of the Risen Lord: the Christian must consider himself alive to God in Christ Jesus.<sup>2</sup> In one or two passages the life of the believer is represented as the very *ψυχή* of the risen (exalted) Christ. Thus 2 Cor. 4:10-11: "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies. For while we live, we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh". The life of the Christian minister or witness (and of Paul in particular) constantly re-enacts the life of Christ. Again Col.3:1-4: "You have

1 Leenhardt, Epistle to the Romans (ET, London, 1961) ad loc. Barrett admits that the future in v.5 might be a purely "logical" future, but this (he thinks) would not agree with the undoubtedly temporal reference in the future at v.8. He adds that Paul is always cautious of expressions which might suggest that the Christian has already reached his goal. H.Koester, NTS, VIII, (1962) p.329 n.2 claims that in the genuine Pauline letters "the resurrection of the believer remains a future expectation". But Rom.6:1ff suggests clearly that we are now risen with Christ and have entered into the new life.

2 V.8 of the chapter suggests a future hope pointing to the final resurrection ( *συνήσόμεν αὐτῷ* ): but we should not



been raised with Christ. . . You have died and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life (ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν) shall appear, you also will appear with him in glory",<sup>1</sup> brings together the present character of the believer's life - a resurrection life - and the continuing source of that life, which is Christ himself. The difficult passage at Rom.5:10, "Having been reconciled, σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ ", suggests the same thought: "the reconciled share the life of Christ and to share this divine life is to be saved indeed".<sup>2</sup> Being raised with Christ, the reconciled man enters the new life which is the only means of salvation in the judgment. In claiming that entry into real life is possible for man on earth, Paul is consistent with his expressed view of the original divine purpose for man. God's original design was to give man life. The commandment of God was intended to bring life ( ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν Rom.7:10) though its purpose was unfulfilled: and Paul is even prepared to say: εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὥτως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ᾔεν ἡ δικαιοσύνη : if a law had been given which could make alive, then righteousness would indeed have sprung from the law" Gal.3:21.

make an oversharpe distinction between that verse and the neighbouring verses, since the formula "with Christ" may be interpreted sacramentally (Col.2) as well as eschatologically.

1 This passage, and Eph.2:6 use the past tense of the Resurrection of Christians, but Koester (see above) is doubtful of the authenticity of both letters.

2 T.W. Manson, Romans, in New Peake, p.944, para. 820b.



In other words, the possession of life is the ideal for humanity, but the law could not give it. But the power of the Spirit enables the believer to receive  $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  (Rom.6:4). By participating in the death and resurrection of Christ the man of faith receives the transformation of life now, in humility and hope, and also the entry into the life eternal.

## Part 2. The Synoptic Gospels.

In discussing the significance of the adjective  $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\circ\varsigma$  we touched on most of the examples of the use of  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$   $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\circ\varsigma$  in the Synoptic gospels. It was suggested that the Synoptic use of the phrase represents the Jewish  $\text{חַיַּת הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא}$ , the Life of the Age to come. Thus Jesus promises (Mk.10:30) that the faithful disciple will receive "in the world to come, life everlasting". Here we are dealing with a future good belonging to a future age, and having the enduring quality of divine life. The use of  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$  by itself is infrequent, but nonetheless significant. In Mark 9:43-47  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$  (vs.43,45) is synonymous with  $\eta$   $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  (47).<sup>1</sup> Now in the teaching of Jesus, entrance into the Kingdom of God is the great end to be sought and is made possible by discipleship. That this "chief end" is

<sup>1</sup> A strong possibility that Mk.9.41ff is an original word of Christ is created by the fact that the section has a clear poetic character when rendered into Aramaic: see M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, (2nd ed. Oxford, 1954) pp.127-28.



also referred to in his teaching as "life" suggests that when John chooses this latter concept to describe the supreme good, he is not inventing something new, but is interpreting something which lies in the primitive tradition: the roots of his leading theme are in the teaching of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, (if we may anticipate a little) John's characteristic emphasis on the present possibility of "life" is also explicable in terms of the equation with the Kingdom", for, however much "the Kingdom" bore a future reference, it was in a real sense inaugurated in the coming of Christ and membership of it was a present possibility for his disciples.<sup>2</sup>

At Mt.19:17 *ἡ γὰρ* is synonymous with *ἡ δὲ* in v.16, while at Mt.7:14 "the gate is narrow and the way hard that leads εἰς τὴν *ἡ γὰρ* " suggests that disciplined acceptance of the demands of discipleship is the true path into the experience of full life, both present and future.

<sup>1</sup> On this see T.W. Manson, On Paul and John (London, 1963) p.110ff. He shows how the different NT terms for the content of salvation - kingdom, justification, life - connote essentially the same thing and how the means of reaching it is also constant, within the difference of terminology. "Whatever the form of words that is used, two factors remain constant from the Synoptics to John: that the thing that is to be attained is something that belongs to God - He gives it or it is found in his presence - and the attainment of it always depends on some relation of the individual to Christ" (111).

<sup>2</sup> For a recent study of John's teaching on eternal life and its sources in the Synoptics, see A. Feuillet, Études Johanniques, chap.vi.



Part 3. The Fourth Gospel.

Without attempting to treat the problem of the background of Johannine thought, we may fairly claim, on the basis of the survey just completed, that the background of the phrase  $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$  is predominantly Jewish-Hellenistic rather than Graeco-Hellenistic.<sup>1</sup> At the level of terminology, the Fourth Gospel's preference for  $\text{ζωὴ αἰώνιος}$  betrays the Jewish affiliation of its language: the Greek phrase is found only in LXX Dan.12:2, Ps.Sol.3:16, Philo Fug.78 and 4 Mac.15:3 (cf. 2 Mac.7:9): and as we have hinted already the use and meaning of the term may also suggest association with the Jewish doctrine of the Age to come. To the discussion of this in greater detail we now turn.

In the fourth verse of the Prologue we find the affirmation:  $\text{ἐν αὐτῷ (i.e. the Logos) ζωὴ ἦν καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων}$ . While it is true that the ideas represented by  $\text{ζωή}$  and  $\text{φῶς}$  are characteristic of Hellenistic religion and philosophical thought (e.g. C.Her.I and XIII) it would seem that the closest parallels to this statement are found in the OT and Jewish thought. The words of Ps.36 (35): 10 spring to mind immediately and probably influenced John:  $\text{παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς. ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὁρύμεθα φῶς}$ . The Sapiential literature declares that Wisdom is  $\text{ἀπαύγασμα}$  ...

<sup>1</sup> We use these terms to try to designate emphases within Hellenistic thought, which itself cannot be simply contrasted with Jewish. Influences operated both ways to create the mixed thought of Hellenism.



φῶτος ζωῆς (Wisd.7:26), that "he who finds wisdom finds life" (Prov.8:35, LXX αἱ ἐξοδοί μου ἐξοδοὶ ζωῆς ) and that through Wisdom one may possess ἀθανασία (Wisd.8:13,17). Now in Jewish thought the identification of Wisdom with Torah is certainly pre-Christian (cf. Sirach 24) and therefore we may be justified in suggesting that the attributing of the qualities of Wisdom (namely "life" and "light") to Torah is not a late creation, even though many of the expressions of it are relatively late.<sup>1</sup> The contrast between the Torah and the Incarnate Word appears to be one of the governing ideas of the Fourth gospel and it is a major part of the evangelist's intention to show that the revelation in Christ offered in reality what Judaism was meant to offer, but failed to provide, namely a genuine knowledge of God bringing life to men.

The Law as such is not for John a way to the knowledge of God's will. ... It claims to be, but is not, the divine Wisdom, the light of the world, the life of men.

2

But the Life was the light: for the life was the creative life-giving energy of the Logos, and the Logos revealed the knowledge of God. Hence the life was the light of men

<sup>1</sup> Sifre Deut. 11:22 par. 48: "As water is life for the world, so also the words of Torah are life for the world": Deut. R. 7.3 comments on Canticles 1:3 ("Thy name is as ointment poured forth"): "This is said to refer to Torah, 'As oil is life for the world, so the words of the Torah are life for the world; as oil is light for the world, so also are the words of Torah light for the world'".

2 C.H. Dodd, op.cit., p. 86.



which gave them true knowledge and, by its shining, wrought judgment. Christ possessed and manifested life, true life in dependence upon the Father and therefore eternal, and that life is available to men through him. "Thou hast given to the Son power over all flesh that he might give (ἵνα...δῶσῃ aorist) ζωὴν αἰώνιον to all whom thou hast given him" (17:2, cf. 1 Jn.2:25). The Good Shepherd parable reiterates the theme: 10:10 ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσι καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν ; v.28 ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς (my sheep) ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπολωνταὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . The purpose of the mission of Jesus is to give to men life or eternal life: it is stated unequivocally at 10:28, and elsewhere under symbolic language. The gift is received by faith. It is necessary for the Son of Man to be lifted up ( ὑψωθῆναι . i.e. in crucifixion and in glory)<sup>1</sup> ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον 3:15. The following verse (16) again connects the possession of ζωὴ with πίστις , as does 3:36: "He who believes on the Son has ( ἔχει ) eternal life: he who does not obey the Son shall not see life (οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν ) but the wrath of God abides on him". The same theme is found in 5:24: "Verily I say unto you, He that heareth my words and believeth on him that sent me has ( ἔχει ) eternal life: he does not come into judgment, but has passed ( μετὰ βέβηκεν )

<sup>1</sup> Ὑψοῦν in John has a two-fold relation, to suffering and to exaltation. The verbal play is stronger in Syriac and Palestinian Aramaic, since in those languages ܡܬܬܝܠܐ means "to be lifted up" and also "to be crucified".



from death to life", and at 20:31<sup>-372-</sup>, ταῦτα γέγραπται . . . καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ : cf. 6:40,47; 7:38 and 11:25. Concerning these verses a number of important points should be noted.

(1) As we have seen ζωὴ is synonymous with βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 9:45,47 and both are in contrast to γέννα . Now ζωὴ αἰώνιος is first mentioned in John, at 3:15, after the only reference in the Gospel to the Kingdom of God (3:3,5). In fact, the concept of "life" or "eternal life" replaces that of the Kingdom in the Fourth Gospel.

(11) What is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel is its declaration of the possibility of the present possession of life eternal. "He who believes. . . has eternal life".<sup>1</sup> This emphasis accords with the eschatology of the whole Gospel which is essentially a realised eschatology. Judgment has come in Christ: those who are related to him by faith possess now eternal life. This profound reinterpretation of the primitive Christian eschatology may have had its roots in the Synoptic tradition which was aware that somehow the Kingdom had come with Christ: it is consistent with the Pauline doctrine that "life", the sharing in the risen life of Christ, is possible now for the justified man.

<sup>1</sup> Since πιστεύω is only once in Jn. followed by ἐν (3:15), C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to John (London, 1955) p.17 thinks it probable that ἐν αὐτῷ should be construed with ἔχη & α. . . If this were so at this point (and it seems doubtful; X reads εἰς ) it would be unique, for the passages quoted above demonstrate that ζωὴ αἰώνιος is the result of belief in Christ.



(iii) Jn.5:24 is very similar to the Pauline doctrine of justification. The believer does not come into judgment but leaves the courtroom acquitted. John, however, connects faith and the possession of life directly, without "righteousness" as a middle term, so that we may fairly claim that for John the entry into eternal life through faith expresses what the Pauline soteriology expressed by the forensic metaphor of "justification by faith" - a justification which, as our earlier study of δικαιωσύνη revealed, is explicable in terms of the experience of dying with Christ and rising with him into newness of life.

(iv) But what does ζωὴ αἰώνιος mean for John? Is it "everlasting life", with the idea of duration paramount? We have already pointed out that the use of ζωὴ αἰώνιος in the Synoptics almost always refers to the "life of the Age to come": this appears to be the case in John's gospel also. The Jewish doctrine is very probably referred to in 5:39: "You search the Scriptures (ἐρευνᾶν = ψ77, the technical term for Biblical study and exposition), for you think that in them you have eternal life, and it is they which bear witness to me. Yet you refuse to come to me that you may have life (ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε)". The view that such study was the way to the life of the Age to come is a common-place of Rabbinic teaching: e.g. Aboth 2:7 (Hillel) "If a man has gained a good name he has gained something for himself: if



he has gained for himself the words of the Law, he has gained for himself the life of the Age to come (קִנְיָה לֹא קָמִי (קִנְיָה לֹא קָמִי) "and Aboth 6:7 "Torah... gives to them that practise it life in this Age and in the Age to come".<sup>1</sup> The reference within this utterance concerning ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and also in 4:36 and 12:25<sup>2</sup>, to Jewish doctrine creates a strong possibility that John means by the expression "the life of the Age to come".

(v) Assuming this to be the case, how can John claim that the "life of the Age to come" is a present possibility for those who have faith in Christ, that in Him ζωὴ αἰώνιος is present? In the first place, the replacing of the Synoptic "kingdom of God" by "eternal life" may have enabled John to posit presentness of "life", since the Synoptics were aware of the Kingdom's presence in the coming of Christ. Secondly, the fact that "John writes within and for, and from the standpoint of, the post-resurrection Church"<sup>3</sup> may have influenced him in his declaration that what was commonly regarded as a future blessing has become a present fact. The future had now been realised in Christ and in the Resurrection. His risen, exalted life was the life of the promised Age to come, available now, and all who came in faith to

<sup>1</sup> Adolf Schlatter, Der Evangelist Johannes, (Stuttgart, 1948) ad loc. draws attention to a number of other passages expressing the same claim for Torah: Jer. Berak. 6a, Mechil. Ex. 13:3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. C.H. Dodd, op.cit., p.146. <sup>3</sup> Barrett, op.cit., p.179.



Christ might share in it. A third and fruitful line of approach to this problem can be developed from consideration of the type of dualism with which John works. That there is a dualism in John's thought between two worlds - between that of God, light and salvation and that of Satan, darkness and corruption - is undeniably clear and has been illumined by the writings of the Qumran sect. But in John the two worlds are not distinguished according to a horizontal line (as in Judaism), the present world and the world to come, but rather in a vertical line, the world above and the world below (8:23), a celestial and a terrestrial (3:12,31). The temporal, successive idea of the two ages was, in John, in process of dissolution. It was no longer necessary, or even possible, to safeguard the otherness of God, as Judaism had done, by declaring that at some future time the Kingdom would descend from heaven with power. Already it was possible for a new existence (still  $\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ ) to possess a man so that he might see and enter the kingdom of God. The two worlds coexist and overlap. Humiliation and glory, hiddenness and revealedness, this Age and the Age to come, are no longer conceived of as in temporal succession, but coexistent aspects of the one act of revelation in Christ.<sup>1</sup> It is in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C.K. Barrett, "The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel", ET, LIX, (1947-48) pp.302-5. Also F. Mussner, ZfM: Die Anschauung vom 'Leben' im vierten Evangelium, p.86 and L'Evangile de Jean, ed. F.M. Braun (Paris, 1958) p.184.



the perspective of this kind of dualism that we must place the Johannine idea of "life" if we are really to understand it. "Life" is the characteristic of the world above: it belongs to God, while to the world below belongs corruption and death. God has sent his Son, the Logos, the bearer of Life, to save men and give them life, and the incarnation is the appearing of the divine life. The eschatological (divine) life is thus present in the "now" of the Christ-event. But paradoxically, it is the death of Christ which is the necessary preliminary to the gift: the death of Christ delivers man from the dominion of this world, and, when that is accomplished, man can receive the gift of life through faith and the Sacraments. This, however, is to anticipate our discussion.

Thus far we have been treating only the present reality of  $\{ \omega \}$  in the faithful. There are also in John's Gospel statements which reflect the usual late-Jewish and Christian eschatology. Bultmann and other commentators ascribe these to Church redaction. Such an authoritarian attitude seems unjustified and unnecessary, a solution of a Johannine problem by "textual surgery". Let us examine the statements in context.

He who hears my words and believes on him that sent me has eternal life: he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life. (24)

Here we have the statement of realised eschatology.



The hour is coming and now is when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear will live (  $\psi\chi\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$  ), 25.

The imagery has taken on an apocalyptic ring. With v.27 the pattern of thought changes and v.28 continues:

The hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good to the resurrection of life (  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$   $\zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$  ) and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgement. (28-29). 1

This view is not antithetical to the other: both are in an organic relation. The evangelist agrees with the popular Christian eschatology that the believer will enter into eternal life at the resurrection: and although this truth is of less importance to John than the fact that the believer may already possess eternal life, it nevertheless remained part of his thought and found expression here. The point of unity is formed by the Johannine Christology. Christ is the  $\zeta\omega\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\omega\nu$  on both levels. The present and continuing "life" is his gift: the recovery of life after the death of the body and the end of the world is his gift; it is the consummation of  $\zeta\omega\eta$ , the final fulfilment of the saying work of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

In Johannine thought the  $\zeta\omega\eta$   $\kappa\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is mediated through faith and through the Sacraments. Several of the

1 Cf. the dramatisation of this saying at 11:25.

2 The "inaugurated" and "to be consummated" aspects of the Kingdom of God and of entry into it in the Synoptic Gospels are united in the doctrine of the person and work of Christ.



statements emphasising the importance of faith have been recorded above. To these we may add 6:40,47; 7:38 and 11:25, all of which clearly relate "faith" to the possession of "eternal life". The characteristic construction of πιστεύω in this connection is π. εἰς αὐτόν ('Ἰησοῦν) i.e. 'I | πιστεύω and this denotes not simply "to give credence to a message" (πιστεύω + dat.) but "to have a firm reliance upon Christ and to recognise as valid the claims made for his person, as the revelation of God."<sup>1</sup> To accept these is to enter into salvation, or, in the Johannine terminology, into life. "This is eternal life, that they know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (17:3). Life is the age-old quest of mankind and the age-old design of God for man. Only in Christ can it be found, who is himself the Way, the Truth and the Life (cf. 1 Jn.5:11). When a man thus admits "who Jesus is" and, in so doing, submits to His judgment upon his search for life, that is to begin to possess the life which is life indeed. It is new life born out of the death of the old. "Verily, I say unto you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit. He who loves his life (ψυχῇ) loses it, but he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life (the life of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Bultmann, Faith (Bible Key words: ET from TWNT: London 1961) pp.98ff. Also C.H. Dodd, op.cit., pp.182-84.



the Age to come)", 12:24-25. In the death and the resurrection of Christ is the real gift of life: in death and resurrection with Christ is the true life acquired by man.<sup>1</sup>

We have already alluded to the idea that ζωὴ αἰώνιος is mediated also by the Sacraments. The connection with Baptism seems to be implicit in 3:3-5, "unless a man is born ἄνωθεν . . . unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot see the Kingdom of God". Apart from these two verses John uses ζωὴ αἰώνιος instead of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ; therefore we may justifiably claim that the entry into "eternal life" is conditional upon rebirth, or regeneration through baptism and endowment with the Spirit. The possibility of rebirth (as vs. 13-15 makes clear) lies in the descent in love of the Son of man and his "elevation" on the Cross;<sup>2</sup> the possibility becomes an actuality for those who have faith.

The association of "life" with the Eucharist is found in 6:52ff. The argument of the chapter (from v.22) develops the theme of the "bread of life" in three stages. (1) Man must labour ( ἐργάζεσθαι ), not for the bread which perishes, but for the bread which abides unto eternal life ( βρωσις μένουσα εἰς ῥ.α. ), which the Son of Man will give. The word ἐργάζεσθαι stirs up the question of the 1 Paul states the same truth in terms of δικαιοσύνη .

2 1 Jn.5:6ff brings together the baptism and death of Jesus and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.



place of works in religion, but Jesus declares that faith alone is necessary (29). The request for a sign leads to a recalling of the manna story, and from this point Jesus identifies the bread which comes down from heaven with himself, who, as Son of Man, has come down from heaven: 8:33,35 - "The bread of God is he that comes down from heaven and gives life to the world (ζῶν δίδους τῷ κόσμῳ)" and "ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς". In this section a contrast appears to be drawn between the Torah and the true bread of God. In Rabbinic teaching bread is a common symbol of the Torah. This tradition can be traced back to the time of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and Joshua ben Chananiah (c.90 A.D.)

A proselyte (גל) asked the meaning of Deut.10:18, "The Lord loveth the stranger (גל) in giving him bread and raiment (חֶמֶד וְסֵטוֹ)": R. Joshua interpreted thus: Bread means the Torah, as it is written, "Come, eat of my bread (i.e. the bread of wisdom)" Prov.9:5, and raiment means the scholar's robe; if a man gets Torah, he gets the scholar's robe. Gen.R. 70.5.

R. Berechiah on Prov.25:21

If thy enemy hunger, feed him with bread, i.e. with the bread of Torah; if he thirst, give him water to drink, the water of Torah. Pesiq. 80b.

Consequently it was natural to think of Torah as the bread of Moses and a simple step to identify it with manna.<sup>1</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> Dodd, op.cit., p.336, "The equation of manna with σοφία in Philo almost necessarily implies that in some circles it was taken to be a symbol of Torah." In late Rabbinic tradition the second giving of manna is a fixed feature of Jewish eschatological expectation. Thus another level of meaning in the story is that the Jews are asking Jesus to establish his Messianic claims by the sign of renewing the gift of manna.



the Torah was not able to give eternal life, although it promised it: only Jesus gave ζωὴ αἰώνιος to those who came to him in faith.

(11) The second section (41-51) makes the significant addition that the bread which Jesus will supply is his flesh, and his flesh is given for the life of the world.

I am the living bread which came down from heaven:  
if anyone eats of this bread he will live for ever.  
And the bread which I shall give is my flesh (given)  
for the life of the world. (51).

This is a plain reference to the sacrificial death and points forward to the allusion to the Eucharist in the final section.

(111) vs. 52-59. The addition of "blood" comes at v.53: "unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you (οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ) He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood ἔχει ὧ ζωὴν and I will raise him up at the last day". The summary is at v.57: "he who eats me φάγεται δι' ἐμέ ". The flesh and blood of Christ are truly food and drink to those who receive them, because, by means of them, a reciprocal indwelling of Christ and the believer is established, and through this union with Christ, by mutual indwelling, man experiences and enjoys eternal life.

The whole discourse is illumined by the reference to the Spirit in the verse which follows. The flesh of which Jesus has spoken is the vehicle of the life-giving Spirit



to those who believe (63) as are the words which he has spoken (τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἐστὶ καὶ ζωὴ ἐστίν): since they are of the Spirit they generate life, for real life is essentially ἐκ πνεύματος. The words of Moses were unable to perform this, although they promised it - "The words of the Law (הַדְּבָרִים הַלֵּזֶם) which I have given you are life for you (מִהֶם חַיִּים)", Mechil.Ex.15:26:cf.Gal.3:21. Jesus alone has the words of eternal life (ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις ), 6:68, for they are alive and convey life to those who hear and believe (cf.5:24 and 12:50). There is no opposition between the life-giving flesh and the life-giving words: each has its life-giving quality, not in itself but in its witness to the living Christ, and in its being the vehicle of the Spirit to bring men into communion with the Christ.<sup>1</sup>

At 7:38 the Spirit is mentioned under the image of living water (ὕδωρ ζῶν ). In order to retain the parallelism of the saying and in view of the context, it seems preferable to interpret the verse as follows: "If anyone thirst, let him come to me; and let him drink who believes on me: as the Scripture says, 'Out of the midst of him (i.e. out of the midst of Me, the Christ) shall flow rivers of living water'".<sup>2</sup> If we interpret thus, the saying

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dodd, op.cit., p.342 note 3.

<sup>2</sup> The punctuation of this verse remains in dispute: scholars are almost evenly divided in opinion. Dodd, Bultmann and Jeremias prefer the reading adopted above, while Barrett



is clearly connected with what follows. It is from Christ, (for John, the glorified Christ), that the Spirit proceeds. The same image occurs in the conversation with the Samaritan woman at 4:14 - "The water which I shall give to him (who drinks) will be in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life". "Living water" as a metaphor for the quickening energies of God appears in the OT (Ezek.47:9, Zech.14:8, Jer.2:13), and in the Rabbinic literature the metaphor of water is used both for the Torah<sup>1</sup> and the Holy Spirit. While it would be unwise to deny that John is here again suggesting the contrast between the life-giving power of Christ and the failure of the Torah to provide it, yet he seems to wish to emphasise by the metaphor the reference to the Holy Spirit. SB, II, 434ff. draws attention and Lightfoot retain the customary interpretation, that the believers themselves give life. In a valuable discussion Hoskyns and Davey (The Fourth Gospel, London, 1940, p.365f.) suggest that both meanings are Johannine. Jesus is the donor of Life (2:1-11, 19:34, 1Jn.5:6-8) and those who believe are the creative source of new life to others (4:10-14); but the subsidiary (i.e. the second) meaning presses upon the primary in the author's mind. See also the discussions on this verse in RB, LXV, (1958) pp.523-546, LXVI (1959) pp. 369-386, LXVII (1960) pp.224-45: also K.G. Kuhn in NTS, IV, (1957-58) pp. 63-65.

1 See Adolf Schlatter. Der Evangelist Johannes, ad loc. To the reference at Gen.26:19 to φάλαγξ ὕδατος ζώντος the Targum says כְּתִיבִי אֵין יְתֵא דְמַתִּי לֵין כְּבִרְא דְמַתִּי לֵין, the words of the law likened to a well of living water. Some other references on the same theme are given by C.H. Dodd, op.cit., p.83.



to the use of "water" and "living water" as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, and especially to Gen.R.70.8 where the water-drawing of Tabernacles is interpreted as drawing the Holy Spirit: and the setting of the Johannine saying is the Feast of Tabernacles. The "living water" is the gift of Holy Spirit which is the source of eternal life to men.

We have already discussed the presentness of "eternal life" in response to faith. Now, to end with, we turn our attention to the Johannine understanding of the content and character of this life. Two categories predominate: that of joy (15:11, 16:20-24, 17:13 and 1 Jn.1:4) and more especially that of love (ἀγάπη). The divine eternal life was manifested in Jesus (1 Jn.1:2) and offered to men in him. Its availability is grounded in God's self-giving love (3:16), and as the life of Jesus illustrates this comprehending and sacrificial love, so also will the lives of his disciples (15:12ff.). The words of T.W. Manson on this theme serve well as the conclusion of our study;

The vitality of God overflows into the world: it is creative life and what it creates is a fellowship of love: "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren" (1 Jn. 3:14).

The new life shows its divine quality by the way it becomes creative in the love of the brethren. Salvation for John is life - life that is eternal, continually creative, continually spending itself in love yet never diminished, the kind of life



that age does not weary nor the years condemn. It is a life of fellowship - with God who gives it, with Christ who mediates it, with the brethren who share it.

1

## XI. Summary.

We have now completed our examination of the Johannine use of *ζωή αἰώνιος* and of the various symbols by which it is explained. It is apparent that, while the terminology and thought of the evangelist resemble those of Greek philosophy, the roots of his theme are to be found in Jewish teaching. In his treatment of "eternal life" as the content of salvation John is true to the Jewish-Synoptic-Pauline tradition: he builds upon it, emphasising in his unique way, the present reality of the "life of the Age to come" in the experience of the believer. This is explicable in terms of the revised dualism (vertical rather than horizontal) with which he works, and by means of which he can declare that the life of the realm above, real life, interpenetrates and overlaps this world. This is the life of the incarnate, crucified and glorified Christ, shared by those who, through faith and obedience, come to him and submit to his judgment and so are renewed in their being. It is mediated and maintained by the Sacraments which, like the words of Christ, are the vehicles of the Spirit to create communion between Christ and his people, a relationship which is to be consummated at the general resurrection.

<sup>1</sup> On Paul and John, p.113, 115.



THE BACKGROUND AND BIBLICAL USAGE  
OF THE TERM  $\pi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  .

	Page
I. The Old Testament Use of $\square 17$	387
II. The Classical Greek Usage of $\pi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$	409
III. The Usage of the Septuagint	416
IV. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	421
V. Philo Judaeus	427
VI. The Rabbinic Literature	435
VII. The Dead Sea Scrolls	450
VIII. The New Testament Usage	464
Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels	464
Part 2. The Acts of the Apostles	497
Part 3. The Writings of Paul	512
Part 4. The Gospel of John	550



I. The Old Testament Use of רוּחַ .

The Hebrew word which most nearly corresponds to the Greek πνεῦμα is רוּחַ . This term, ordinarily translated "spirit", has as its primary sense (like πνεῦμα , derived from πνέειν "to breathe") "air in motion", and therefore "wind" or "breath". While there may be divergence of opinion as to which of these two meanings came first, it is not correct to claim (as some scholars have done<sup>1</sup>) that the meaning "breath" did not appear until after the Exile. According to C. Virolleaud, רוּחַ signifies "vital breath" (of animals) in the Ras Shamra texts,<sup>2</sup> and that meaning is implied in several OT passages which certainly pre-date the Exile. In Ex. 15:8 and 2 Sam. 22:16 (= Ps. 18:16) "the ruach of the nostrils of Yahweh" signifies the "wind" and ruach must be understood as "breath".<sup>3</sup> On the basis of these poetical passages, which witness to the primitive belief that the wind is the breath of God, one is tempted to claim that the original meaning of רוּחַ is "breath", emerging from nose

<sup>1</sup> E.W. Burton, Spirit, Soul and Flesh, (Chicago, 1918) p.61; J. Hempel, Gott und Mensch im AT, (2 ed. Stuttgart, 1936), p. 105; H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology" (in The People and the Book, ed. A.S. Peake, p.360) and Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, (Oxford, 1946) p.75.

<sup>2</sup> Syria, XVIII, (1937), p.86. Cf. A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, (Cardiff, 1949) p.27.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hos.13:15; Is.11:4, 30:28, where the "breath" of God signifies the "wind".



or mouth, and that the meaning has been extended to "wind", this being regarded as the "breath" of a powerful being.

Speculation on primitive ideas and original meanings is not significantly fruitful for our study: we are concerned with the range of meaning of  $\square\cdot\dot{\text{I}}\cdot\dot{\text{I}}$  to be found within the literature of the OT. Of the 378 occurrences of  $\square\cdot\dot{\text{I}}\cdot\dot{\text{I}}$ , about one-third,<sup>1</sup> spread throughout the whole period of the OT, denote "wind" or are closely associated with that idea. Among the latter are those passages (mostly poetical) mentioned above in which the  $\square\cdot\dot{\text{I}}\cdot\dot{\text{I}}$  ("breath" of Yahweh signifies the "wind". Of the many occasions on which  $\square\cdot\dot{\text{I}}\cdot\dot{\text{I}}$  must itself be translated "wind", we may mention a few which demonstrate the conviction that the wind is under Yahweh's control and is one medium through which he exerts his power. Yahweh brings forth the winds from his treasure, Ps. 135:7; Jer.10:13: he makes them his messengers, Ps. 104:4: he created the wind and regulates its force, Amos. 4:13; Job 28:25: he sends a wind to assuage the Flood, Gen. 8:1 (P); in the J story of the Exodus, the wind is the agent in bringing the plague of locusts (Ex. 10:13b, 19) and in causing the sea to recede before Israel (14:21). When  $\square\cdot\dot{\text{I}}\cdot\dot{\text{I}}$  means "wind", the notion of strength or violence is generally present, e.g. Prov.27:16, Ps. 55:8, Is. 7:2, Ezek. 1:4, 17:10, 19:12: only occasionally is there no sense of power

I H.W. Robinson (Inspiration and Revelation, p.74) reckons the number at 131.



and force, eg. Ps. 78:39, Zech. 5:9, Gen. 3:8.

The proportion of cases where the idea of strength and violence is intended in all uses of ruach (wind) is three to one. This is counting all the twenty-two cases (nine in Ecclesiastes and seven in Job) where the meaning is "vanity, breath, emptiness". Apart from these cases, the proportion is fifteen to one. 1

As well as being powerful, the wind is invisible, mysterious and impalpable; it knows no limits, yet no-one knows its origin. To this extent, any mysterious, unpredictable power is akin to the wind. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that exceptional displays of power in men are ascribed to the action of the ruach of Yahweh: the same characteristics - strength and mystery - belonged to these prodigious exploits as to the energies of the wind.

This brings us to the second main use of רוח , viz. to denote supernatural influences acting upon men, and very occasionally on inanimate objects:<sup>2</sup> we may call this the "inspirational" or "charismatic" connotation of ruach Yahweh (or Elohim). In the historically earliest sources, the ruach (in this sense) acted in an intermittent fashion: it fell unexpectedly on certain individuals, particularly

1 N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 182. There is a derived use of ruach meaning "a point of the compass", e.g. "Come from the four winds.." This is found ten times in Ezekiel, four in Jeremiah, three in Dan., two in Zech. and once in 1 Chron. We may be confident that this is a post-exilic use of the word.

2 H.W. Robinson, op.cit., p.74 reckons that this use accounts for 134 of the total occurrences of the word.



the early prophets and the warriors who saved Israel.<sup>1</sup> When the spirit (  $\text{רוח}$  ) "was upon" Othniel (Jud. 3:10) and upon Jephthah (11:29), when it "put on" (  $\text{שָׁלַח}$  ) Gideon (6:34) and "rushed upon" (  $\text{הִלָּח}$  ) Saul (1 Sam. 11:6), these men, obscure in themselves, became heroic and won unexpected victories over the enemies of Israel. When it "pushed" (  $\text{דָּחַק}$  ) Samson (Jud. 13:25) or "rushed upon" him (14:6), he slew a lion with his hands, killed thirty men (14:19), broke his bonds like flax and slew a thousand Philistines (15:14ff). Two observations may be made here: first, the coming of the spirit (  $\text{רוח}$  ) of the Lord on a man was a direct irruption of divine power, violent and overwhelming, but it was temporary, given to him to deal with a crisis, and not as a permanent endowment: secondly, these crises were moments of supreme importance both for the safety and for the faith of the nation: it was the action of the spirit in energising the victorious chiefs which restored the confidence of the people in the power of God and the reality of the Covenant.

Ces gestes ... ne sont pas seulement des gestes merveilleux, ce sont tous les gestes de libération. Exploits isolés de héros locaux, ils font partie d'une même histoire, ils marquent les étapes de la

<sup>1</sup> The "spirit" does not appear to have been ascribed to the kings in their ruling functions: their decisions were based on oracles (2 Sam. 14:17, 20; 1 Kings 3:11, 12). 1 Sam. 16:13-14 and 2 Sam. 23:2 attribute the "spirit" to David: the second passage comes from a poem which has similarities to some of the Wisdom writings and may be a late composition, but 1 Sam. 16: 13-14 suggests a connection between the anointing of the king and the bestowal of the spirit, and so supports the view that the gift was virtually limited to leaders of the people.



marche progressive qui conduisit Israël à l'indépendance. C'est ce mouvement de libération qui fait leur unité. L'intervention, à ces différentes étapes, de l'esprit de Y. souligne l'un des axes de l'action divine dans l'AT. L'esprit de Dieu est à la source de la communauté nationale d'Israël.

1

The ecstasies and oracles of the early prophets were also attributed to the action of the "spirit of Yahweh" (  $\text{רוח יהוה}$  ). Indeed, the "spirit" was so characteristic of the prophet that he could be called  $\text{רוח יהוה}$  (Hos. 9:7). In the days of Samuel, the strange actions and outbursts of the nebiim were ascribed to the effects of spirit-possession (1 Sam. 10:6ff, 19:20ff). Their ecstasy was infectious: on meeting a company of such men, Saul, seized by the "spirit" which "rushes on" him (  $\text{נצח}$  ), was transformed into another man and began to prophesy (1 Sam. 10:9f.) Strange, violent and extravagant actions resulted from the possession (1 Sam. 19:19-24, 1 Kings 18:12, 2 Kings 2:16). According to Num. 11:25ff., Yahweh took some of the spirit that was on Moses and put it upon the seventy elders and they prophesied: they did not continue, and Moses expressed the wish that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them. Examples of oracles attributed to the action of the spirit are later and less numerous. According to Num.24:2, Baalam spoke one when the spirit "was upon him". The onset of the spirit upon these early prophets

I J. Guillet, Themes Bibliques, (Paris, 1950) p.233.



is the same as that on the warriors of Israel: it was a strange, violent and temporary endowment which produced abnormal experience: it was not an abiding gift.

While the action of the "spirit" is not absent from the activities of the great prophets, the claim to spirit-possession is very infrequent in their writings. The pre-exilic prophets never (with the possible exception of Micah 3:8, if the words "the ruach of Yahweh" are not a later interpolation) speak of "being possessed by the spirit" in order to justify or authenticate their inspiration. It may be that opposition to the irrational and extravagant frenzies provoked by the spirit in the early prophets accounts for the suppression of the idea.<sup>1</sup> Possession of the word of God, the knowledge that "Thus saith the Lord..." now qualifies the prophet for his ministry.<sup>2</sup>

After the Exile, the "spirit" reappears as an essential element in the inspiration of the prophets. Thus Ezekiel speaks and acts under the control of the "spirit" (2:2, 3:24, 11:5 etc.) and it is to the "spirit" that he attributes his reception of the divine message and his power

<sup>1</sup> See S. Mowinkel, "The Spirit and the Word in the pre-exilic reforming prophets", JBL, LIII, (1934) pp. 199-227.

<sup>2</sup> We ought not, however, to differentiate too radically between "spirit of Yahweh" and "word of Yahweh". Ps. 33:6 (and possibly Gen.1) brings together the creative breath and the creative word. On this see P. van Imschoot, "L'esprit de Yahvé, source de vie dans l'AT", RB, XLIV, (1935) pp. 481-501.



to proclaim it. Several of the post-exilic texts which review Israel's history present that history as the result of the nation's attitude to the "spirit of God" manifesting itself through the prophets. For instance, in the great prayer of repentance in Neh. 9 we read:

Thou didst warn them by the spirit (  $\text{רוח}$  )  
through the prophets, yet they would not  
give ear: therefore thou didst give them  
into the hands of the people of the lands (v.30).

In a similar context of ideas, Zechariah declares:

'They made their hearts like adamant lest they  
should hear the law and the words which the  
Lord of hosts had sent by his spirit through  
the former prophets. (7:12).

The continuing inspiration of prophets demonstrates that the action and power of the "spirit" were not solely explosive and spasmodic phenomena. Many texts describe it as a permanent endowment to enable a man to fulfil certain functions. The "spirit" was on Moses (Num. 11:17, 25) and was transmitted to his successor, Joshua (Num. 27:18, Deut. 34:9). A part of the "spirit" of Moses rested on (  $\text{רוח}$  ) the seventy elders chosen to assist him in judging the people: the "spirit" rested or settled on Elisha (2 Kings 2:15) who had inherited it from Elijah (2 Kings 2:9): it filled (  $\text{מל$  ) the artisans who were commissioned to fashion the furniture of the cult (Ex. 28:3, 31:3, 35:31): and it was in Joseph, conferring upon him wisdom for the good government of Egypt (Gen. 41:38-40). While such endowments cannot be



regarded as instances of explosive power momentarily bursting upon individuals, they, nonetheless, refer to the powerful expression of God's presence in a man, an exceptional heightening of natural gifts already possessed.<sup>1</sup>

The past history of Israel was not regarded as the only scene of the spirit's action. The future would experience outpourings even more wonderful. The future age would be characterised by abundant fruitfulness, judgment and righteousness in the social order - all of which would be the results of the Spirit from on high (Is. 32:15ff.); the "shoot from the stem of Jesse", the Messianic king, would be endowed with the spirit which would direct all his activities (Is. 11:1ff). This is not an outburst on the occasion of his accession, but part of his permanent equipment - "ein sittlicher und religiöser Charakter".<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the spirit was expected to rest upon the Servant of Yahweh: Is. 42:1 "I have put my spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth justice (i.e. true religion) to the

<sup>1</sup> A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, (2nd ed. Cardiff, 1961) pp.15ff. interprets the Spirit acting upon man as an "extension of Yahweh's personality". "God", he says, "is thought of in terms similar to those of man as possessing an indefinable extension of the Personality which enables him to exercise a mysterious influence upon mankind. In its creative aspect this appears as 'blessing'; in its destructive aspect it makes itself felt as a 'curse'." (p.16). Other extensions of Y's personality include his Name, the Word, the Angel, the Ark.

<sup>2</sup> G. Gerleman, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, (3te Auflage, Tübingen, 1956) sub "Geist im AT." p.1270.



nations": and the prophet-messenger of Is.61 would declare "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted; he has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives. ." (v.lff.). The endowment with "spirit" was not conceived as the prerogative of special individuals: in the future age, all the people were to be the recipients of the gift. "I will pour my spirit upon all flesh.." (Joel 3:1 MT): "I will pour my spirit upon your descendants and my blessing on your offspring" (Is.44:3). When this spirit was spread abroad in the hearts of the people, it would bring forth obedience, deliverance and regeneration (Ezek.36:26ff.). This aspect of the spirit's activity, as the source of regenerating power within the community, appears to have been confined to the Messianic era. Only once is moral renewal by the spirit desired by an individual for himself: in Ps. 51:12-14 (MT) we read:

Create in me a clean heart, O God, and put a new  
and right spirit within me ( וְיָצַקְתָּ ִּי ).  
Cast me not away from thy presence and take not  
thy holy spirit from me ( וְלֹא תִשָּׁקֵט רִחְקִי );  
Restore to me the joy of thy salvation and uphold  
me with a willing spirit ( וְיָצַקְתָּ ִּי ).

In this prayer v.12 desires stability or steadfastness of the disposition and personality, and v.14 a spirit that is ready and willing to respond obediently to God's demands.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A spirit like that described in Ex.35:21. רִחְקִי means also "noble or princely" and the LXX has ἡγεμονικόν; but that nuance is not likely to be present here.



Within the context of such a prayer for self-renewal it seems probable that the meaning of  $\eta\psi\eta\tau\ \eta\eta$  will have some ethical content. It must be parallel to the preceding petition, "Cast me not away from thy presence", and we would submit that it means the inward sense of the presence and power of the holy God, which both purifies and inspires to obedient and righteous living, in short, the inward power which makes for holiness.<sup>1</sup> Occasionally  $\eta\eta$  refers to the spirit which guides and instructs towards righteousness: Ps. 143:10 "Teach me to do thy will. ... Let thy good spirit lead me on a level path", and Neh. 9:20 (referring to

1 Cf. H.J. Kraus, Biblischer Commentar, Psalmen I (Neukirchen 1960) ad loc.: " $\eta\psi\eta\tau\ \eta\eta$  ist in Ps. 51 die Gottesmacht, die den Menschen aussondert, reinigt und ihn im Innersten dazu antreibt, Jahwes Willen gehorsam zu erfüllen, Ez. 36:27." This is the usual interpretation of the phrase: cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms (Eng. Trans. London, 1962) ad loc: and M. Butterwieser, The Psalms, (Chicago, 1938) p. 191 calls the  $\eta\eta$  "the power of the good within man". T.W. Manson, On Paul and John, (London, 1963) p. 34 speaks of the holy spirit here as being "the moral and religious consciousness that tells man when he sins" or even as "the better self". But this is to neglect the positive and active role of the Spirit's presence which Manson himself suggests when he uses the phrase "a power that inspires man to holy and righteous life" (p. 34). In a book devoted to the study of the Psalm (Psalm Fifty-One, Leiden, 1962) E.R. Dalglish puts forward a new interpretation (pp. 157ff). Because the gift of the Spirit was reserved for special individuals in Israel, the Psalmist must be a select personage: he had the holy spirit resident within him, and the only official who had permanent possession of the Spirit of Y. was the king, for the anointing with oil was the sacrament of the bestowal of the spirit. Therefore, the "spirit of holiness" means "royal inviolability" rather than moral power; the notion of holiness must be understood as sacredness rather than as having purely ethical import. To interpret  $\eta\eta$  thus of status rather than of character seems to do less than justice to the



Israel's past) "Thou didst give thy good spirit to instruct them". This aspect of the Spirit's activity is parallel to the work of "wisdom" in the Sapiential books (cf. Job 32:8).<sup>1</sup>

Apart from Ps.51:13 the only occurrence of the phrase "the holy spirit" (lit. "spirit of holiness") is in Is.63:10-11.

But they rebelled and grieved his holy spirit ( q.17  
iψ7p): therefore he was turned to be their  
 enemy and himself fought against them.  
 Then he remembered the days of old, Moses and  
 his people (saying)  
 Where is he that brought up from the sea the  
 shepherds of his people?  
 Where is he who put in the midst of them his  
 holy spirit?

The "holy spirit" here is the active, directing presence of God in Israel's life, "holy" because it is the presence of the holy God who requires his people to be holy and obed-

context (despite Dalglish's attempts to prove otherwise). Moreover, the gift of the spirit to the king (even if linked with anointing) was not simply a mark of his position: it was essentially related to his character. The few references we have to the gift of the spirit to David and to Saul prove that the endowment of power for leadership came to them because they were of upright and obedient character, because they possessed the quality which was necessary for kingship over God's people.

1 In the Sapiential literature, apart from the Book of Wisdom, the "spirit" plays an insignificant role. In Wisdom, however, many passages suggest that "wisdom", like "spirit", is a divine power active in Creation (9:2,9) and assists the righteous man to fulfil God's will (9.11 and 10:5); again, it appears to be, like "spirit", a principle of moral life, communicated to the righteous. On the close relation between "wisdom" and "spirit" see P. van Imschoot, "Sagesse et Esprit dans l'AT", RB, XLVII, (1938) pp.23-49.



ient to his will. Now this directing presence was embodied in the prophetic ministry which was inspired by the spirit (cf. Neh. 9:30, Zech. 7:12). Therefore, at v.10 the "grieving of his holy spirit" means the rejection of the prophetic instruction by which God sought to guide his people towards righteousness,<sup>1</sup> and in v.11 the words "who put in the midst of them his holy spirit" are to be understood of the spirit resting upon Moses, the agent of God's warning and instruction, cf. Num. 11:17.<sup>2</sup>

We may say then that "holy spirit", both in Ps. 51 and Is. 63 has as its essential background the divine demand, God's holy will. Within Israel's national life, this standard was revealed and proclaimed in the (ethical) instruction and theology of the prophets, which, according to Is. 63, the people rejected: in the life of the individual (Ps. 51) this directing presence of God is the inner awareness of the divine demand, which is itself the inspiration and power for holy living.

The ruach Yahweh then is essentially the divine presence experienced in terms of power for action,<sup>3</sup> whether

1 The verb "vex" or "grieve" (נָחַם) almost always has a personal object: this suggests a degree of personification in the term "holy spirit" which is preserved in the interpretation we have adopted.

2 "This spirit is a national endowment, residing in the community: it is the spirit of prophecy, resting on Moses, but manifesting its presence also through other organs of revelation", J. Skinner, Isaiah 40-66, (Cambridge, 1898) p.201

3 "The Egyptians are men (אֲנָשִׁים) and not God (אֱלֹהִים) and their horses are flesh (בָּשָׂר) and not spirit (רוּחַ)" says the



it be prophetic utterance, heroic exploit or righteous living: the ruach is not an agent with its own existence and actions,<sup>1</sup> A.R. Johnson speaks of it as an extension of Yahweh's personality, by which he exercises influence on mankind,<sup>2</sup> and Manson calls it "the power through which God works and manifests himself in the world".<sup>3</sup> In short, the ruach is God in his presence to, and action within the world, the divine creative, energising and renewing power in the lives of men and communities.

The Spirit of God is hardly considered another distinct from Him; it is God exercising power, communicating himself, or operating. This power may be simply vital power, physical life; or it may be intellectual, moral and religious life. These are all communicated by the Spirit or

רוח of God.

4

book of Isaiah 31:3. The juxtaposition of בן and רוח designates that which is strong, lasting and immortal. Without actually saying that God is "spirit", Isaiah's thought certainly moves in that direction. In his eyes, Yahweh "represents all that can be called el and ruach", Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja, (3te auf. Göttingen, 1914) p.205.

1 That the Hebrews did sometimes represent the ruach as a concrete entity, separable in some way from Yahweh (e.g. Ps. 104:30 "when Thou sendest forth thy spirit. . .") does not conflict with this judgment. The thought of the Hebrew was imaginative: he expressed himself in the language of pictures drawn from sense impressions, and that language remained poor in abstract terms, being dominated by concrete images. Now the "spirit" like the "word" is rather more exterior to a person and more separable than hands, arms and mouth: breath, like speech, acts when it has gone forth from a living being. Consequently, the ruach of Y. could, in a sense, be represented as an entity acting apart from Y., though never really distinct from him. Cf. E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, p.121.

2 Op.cit., p.36.

3 Op.cit., p.33.

4 A.B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, p.193.



We turn now to the use of רִיחַ to denote the principle of life in both human beings and animals, usually in association with neshamah or nephesh.<sup>1</sup> The words רִיחַ and נֶפֶשׁ (Is.42:5, 57:16, Job 4:9, 33:4, 34:14) and רִיחַ and שְׁנֵי (Is.26:9, Job 7:11, 12:10) are parallel and practically equivalent. As שְׁנֵי רִיחַ is used at Gen. 2:7 to denote the vital breath of living beings, so is רִיחַ רִיחַ used at Gen.6:17, 7:15 (P), Num. 16:22 etc. for the breath of life in men and animals.<sup>2</sup> In the idols, which are dead, there is no (Ps. 135:17, Jer.10:14). The Anointed of the Lord, under whose shadow Israel lives, is called the "breath of our nostrils", שְׁנֵי רִיחַ (Lam.4:20) i.e. the very means of existence. Life lasts only as long as the breath (ruach or neshamah) remains in the living being: when it is withdrawn, death ensues.

Thou hidest thy face, they are dismayed;  
Thou gatherest their ruach, they expire and  
unto their dust they return.  
Thou sendest thy ruach and they are created  
And Thou renewest the face of the ground. Ps.104:29.

Yahweh both gives and takes away "breath" and is thus the source of life to all creatures, just as in Egyptian, Baby-

I H. Robinson, op.cit., p.74 reckons that there are 39 such occurrences.

2 Gen.7:22(J) combines רִיחַ and נֶפֶשׁ; MT reads שְׁנֵי רִיחַ but LXX omits רִיחַ reading πνοή ζωής. Most scholars claim that רִיחַ is not original, being interpolated from 7:15. A. R. Johnson (The Vitality of the Individual p.31) does not share this opinion. The expression שְׁנֵי רִיחַ is found in the ancient poetical passage 2 Sam. 22:16 (= Ps.18:16) and it is not impossible that the MT has preserved the authentic J reading.



lonian, Canaanite and Phoenician thought, the god gives<sup>1</sup> life by communicating the vital breath or his own breath. Yahweh is God of the "spirits" (or "vital breath") of all flesh (Num.16:22, 27:16). To Him, at death, the ruach returns (Eccles. 12:7<sup>2</sup> and cf. Ps.31:6). The vital character of ruach is further witnessed to in Ezek.37 which proclaims the restoration or resurrection of the nation by the coming of the breath of God ( אֱלֹהִים ) from the four winds or compass points ( אֲרָבָה ). We find intermingled here the ideas of אֱלֹהִים as "wind", as the "principle of life" and as the "agent of moral renewal" (cf. 36:22ff) but it would be unwise to press out of the symbolism support for the Greek (Orphic) notion that vivifying spirit was borne through the universe by the wind.

There is some similarity between the ideas of Ezek.37 and those expressed in Gen.1:2(P), which may be the only place in the OT where the spirit is brought into association with cosmological activity: וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֵף עַל-פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם

Great diversity of opinion exists among interpreters of this verse, and it is impossible to treat it in detail here. That there is present some suggestion of the Babylonian cosmogony and the triumph of Marduk over Tiamat seems certain, but even that admission does not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Hehn, "Zum Problem des Geistes im Alten Orient und im AT", ZAW, XLIII, (1925) pp. 210-25.

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to "vital breath", not disembodied souls.



necessarily mean that the P writer did not have his own content for the words used. For that reason, we think that the translation "a mighty wind (wind of godlike proportions, אֶלֹהִים) swept over the face of the deep"<sup>1</sup> - an interpretation which leans heavily on the fact that Marduk clothed himself in the winds to conquer Tiamat - is rather improbable. In the first place, would the author, who used אֶלֹהִים for the creating God, have employed the same word to describe violence, when other unambiguous words were available?<sup>2</sup> Secondly, the verb מרחפת suggests a slow, fluttering movement, like "hovering" (cf. Deut.32:11) rather than a violent pressure.<sup>3</sup> What then is meant by רוּחַ here?<sup>4</sup> It seems to us that more than one idea is present. In רוּחַ here we may see an allusion to the "spirit of God", the

<sup>1</sup> So von Rad, Eissfeldt, Goodspeed and others. The question we raise is this: "Is that cosmological idea what the author wished to communicate?"

<sup>2</sup> E. Jacob, op.cit., p.144.

<sup>3</sup> The meaning "cover" does not seem adequate in view of the image of Deut. 32:11 where the word is also used. The Syr. use of the root suggests "brood over" and recalls the idea of the fertilised egg in the Phoenician primordial myth.

<sup>4</sup> H.M. Orlinsky, "The New Jewish Version of the Torah", JBL, LXXXII, (1963) pp.254ff. defends the translation "a wind from God, or of God", mainly on the basis of Jewish understandings of the verse and the Mesopotamian creation stories. He claims that it was because of the influence of Philo's tendency to allegorise רוּחַ as "spirit" that the interpretation "wind" was lost. While doubting this claim, we would admit that the translation advocated may be correct, but we suggest that further overtones may be present in the meaning of the term in the usage of the P author.



purposeful power of the Divine, but, at the same time, the רוח is the "breath of God" (like the wind), creative and vivifying. "By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the breath ( רוח ) of his mouth", Ps.33:6. The divine word and the divine breath are not rigidly distinguished: both are active, efficacious entities, involved in the Creation process. Consequently, although there is no further mention of רוח in the narrative of Gen. 1, it is fair to claim that the action of the life-giving breath and of the powerful spirit is given order and direction by the divine word.<sup>1</sup> The creative "breath", which is also the mighty power of the spirit, hovers, waiting . . . , at the command of God, it enters into action constructively.

Returning to the use of רוח in connection with the life of human beings, we must point out that, whereas in the event of the ruach as temporary endowment being withdrawn, the individual returned to normality, remaining entirely alive, when the ruach, as vital breath or the principle of existence, is withdrawn, the result is a loss of strength and consciousness, and ultimately death. For example, because of hunger and thirst, there was no more ruach in Samson, but after he had eaten, his ruach returned and he revived (Jud. 15:19). Likewise, the Queen of Sheba,

<sup>1</sup> J. Hehn, op.cit., p.218f. cites a number of texts which prove that among the Babylonians and Egyptians the breath and the word from the mouth of a god were identical entities, both producing life.



on seeing the wealth of Solomon, had no more ruach in her (1 Kings 10:5): the ruach of Jacob revived when he heard that Joseph was still alive. The absence of רוּחַ will cause some kind of diminished vitality: its presence or return increases strength and well-being. Consequently, we may say that רוּחַ means not only the principle of existence, that which makes the difference between death and life, but denotes also the principle of full vitality, that which makes the difference between half-life (caused by hunger, grief or fainting) and real living. In both cases, the activity of breathing (observed as present or not present, as strong or weak) may provide the key to the understanding of the Hebrew usage,

We now pass to the fourth main group of the uses of רוּחַ, where the word is used psychically, "as the permanent substratum and entity of man's own consciousness, with varied psychical predicates".<sup>1</sup> In other words, ruach (like nephesh and leb) is considered as the seat of the affections, emotions and passions, of the will, and of the intellectual and moral life. This usage develops naturally from the close association observed between ruach as respiration and various feelings and emotions: in anger the breath ( רוּחַ ) is "hot" (Ezek.3:14): in impatience it becomes "short" (Mic.2:7, Ex.6:9, Job 21:4); in terror it is excited

<sup>1</sup> H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology", The People and the Book, p.360.



or troubled (Gen.41:8, Dan. 2:1,3). Given this usage, it is not surprising that the step was taken to the use of רָחַץ to denote the dominant impulse or disposition of an individual. For instance, the Hittite wives of Esau were "bitterness of ruach" to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. 26:35 P), which means that the parents were affected with strong feelings of bitterness when they thought of the marriage. The ruach of jealousy which comes over a man who suspects his wife's unfaithfulness is a feeling of almost irresistible strength. In this way, confusion, impatience, obstinacy and sadness are termed the ruach of trouble (Gen.41:8), of shortness (Ex.6:9), of hardness (Deut.2:30) and of grief (1 Sam.1:15). The "humble" person is the man "of contrite spirit" (נָחָם רָחַץ), Is.66:2, and "sorrow of heart" is equivalent to the "breaking of the ruach" (Is. 65:14).

The ruach may also be the seat of thought. Ideas rise up in the ruach (Ezek.20:32, 11:5) and, together with the heart, the ruach is the controlling power of the moral and religious life, that through which the will finds expression. "Take heed", says Malachi, "to your spirits (רָחַץ) that ye deal not treacherously with the wives of your youth" (2:15). Restoration of character involves the renewal and regeneration of the spirit and the heart (Ezek. 11:19, 18:31 etc.), that is, a complete change of inner life and attitudes. A man in whose spirit (רָחַץ) there is no



guile (Ps. 32:2) is one whose whole disposition towards living is upright. In this use, the meaning of ruach overlaps with the meaning of leb: but, as N.H. Snaith has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> this does not mean that "heart" and "spirit" were equivalent in hebrew thinking: both words, like nephesh as well, had smaller and larger circles of meaning, and in the case of all three, these circles of meaning overlap in the one common area of meaning where each connotes the controlling power in man, the seat of desire, will and emotion.

This leads to our final point. The usage (which is mostly late) of רוח which we have just discussed suggests that "spirit" is part of man himself, the controlling element within him, whereas the more usual idea is of the controlling "spirit" being other than man, as acting upon him from outside. How is this "inner ruach" related to the concept of nephesh? Did the Hebrews admit a dichotomy in their understanding of man - soul and spirit? They did not. In this particular sense of "inner controlling element", ruach denotes (as we have said) the same thing as nephesh when it means the directing element in man's energies, attitudes and emotions. Moreover, the nephesh is not opposed to the ruach in scriptural statements, but is parallel to it (Is. 26:9, Job 7:11, 12:10) and both terms are

<sup>1</sup> Snaith, op.cit., pp. 148-49.



frequently related to the idea of vitality. It may be that, as H.W. Robinson suggests,<sup>1</sup> even when ruach became "naturalised" in human nature, as a synonym of leb or nephesh, it still suggested a reference to the continued use of the word for a supernatural influence, and so supplied a point of contact between man and God. While not wishing to be dogmatic, we are inclined to doubt this. There is no passage to suggest that the ruach Yahweh acts only on the ruach of man or that there is any substantial likeness between them. The two differing uses of the word seem to stem from two different strands of meaning which had attached themselves to the word in the course of its historical development, one relating to human psychology, the other to divine power endowed. The Hebrews never failed to distinguish between God and Man. The use of a word, which itself bore many senses, in two ways which suggest the minimising of that distinction is an insufficient basis for Robinson's statement.

This sketch of the use and meaning of רוח in the OT may be concluded by restating the four main senses in which it is found: (i) as the description of the "wind", especially as created and controlled by God; (ii) in the "charismatic" sense, the Spirit of God being an endowment of men with I Inspiration and Revelation, p. 76.



special powers, in the form of a temporary phenomenon or as a permanent gift to fulfil certain functions. Within this usage, it becomes a sign of God's renewing and regenerating activity in the Coming Age. The special usage "holy spirit" refers to the directing presence of God, the awareness of the demand of God's holy will both in the community (through the prophetic ministry) and in the individual, in whose experience this awareness inspires to righteousness of life. (iii) it is used of the principle of existence and vitality, the vivifying breath communicated to men and animals: and, as the powerful divine breath, it is occasionally related to the action of creation: (iv) it is used to denote aspects of, or impulses within, the psychical life of man.

Appended Note. The OT speaks also of "evil spirits": 1 Sam. 16:14, "an evil spirit from the Lord came on Saul", cf. Jud. 9:23 and 1 Kings 22:21 (the  $\square\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}$  who proposed to be a lying spirit in the mouth of all Ahab's prophets). In accordance with the exclusiveness of the OT faith in God, it was God who created these spirits: they were employed in the service of his anger, related to his will. Later these spirits were personalised in "Satan", but behind this idea lies a strong ethicising and "transcendentalising" of the being of God which refused to believe that God could be in any way responsible for evil, even when it was demonstrably under his control. A.R. Johnson (The One and the Many, p.16) thinks of these evil spirits in terms of his thesis of Y's extended personality. He claims that we must be prepared to think of Y. acting not only through the instrumentality of his own  $\square\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}$  but also through the agency of some subordinate  $\square\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}$  who, as a member of his immediate entourage, may be thought of as an individualisation within the corporate  $\square\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}\text{'}$  of Y's extended personality. In this way, the "evil spirits" would be related to the idea of the Heavenly court, as were elohim and mal'akim (Ps. 29:1, 82:1, 89: 7-8).



## II. Classical Greek Usage

The word πνεῦμα (derived from πνέιν "to blow", "to breathe" is not found in Homer, Hesiod or Pindar, but first appears in Aeschylus.<sup>1</sup> The meanings attached to it may be classified as follows.

1. Wind, whether gentle breeze or violent blast. This is the most frequent use of the word, being found in all the main writers of the Classical period, though πνο(ι)ή is more common in the poets, and is used always by Homer for "wind". A few examples will suffice. Aesch. Pers. 110 θαλάσσης πολιαινόμενας πνεύματι λάρβω : Herod. 7:16.1, κατὰ ... θάλασσαν πνεύματα .. ἀνέμων ἐμπίπτοντα (cf. Aesch. Prom. 1086): Plato Phaedr. 229b, πνεῦμα μέτριον ("moderate breeze") Arist. Problemata, 940b7, ἔστι γὰρ πνεῦμα αἶρος κίνησις ("wind is the motion of the air"): Polyb. Hist. 1.44.4, ὑπο τῆς βίας τοῦ πνεύματος ("by the force of the wind").

The word is also used metaphorically for a force affecting the mind, what LS calls "genial breeze or influence". Aesch. Prom. 884, φέρομαι λύσσης πνεύματι μάργῳ "I am driven by a furious wind of madness": Aesch. Theb. 708, δαίμων ... ἴσως ἂν ἔλθοι θαλερωτέρῳ πνεύματι "... fortune might come with fresher breeze": Soph. O.C. 612 πνεῦμα ταῦτόν οὔ ποτ' ... ἐν ἀνδράσιν φίλοις βέβηκεν "the wind

<sup>1</sup> The occurrence of the word in Xenophanes and Anaximenes (both 6th cent. B.C.) is known from the testimony of later writers and will be described later in the study.



is constantly changing among friends": Aesch. Supp. 30, "Receive this suppliant female train αἰδοίῳ πνεύματι χώρας ", This last example might be rendered literally as "with a respectful (i.e. favourable) breeze from the land", but LS treats it as a figure of speech and translates "with air or spirit of respect on the part of the country".<sup>1</sup> Even if we choose the latter interpretation, we must not be tempted by the known use of the English word "spirit" in the sense of "disposition" to attribute such a meaning to πνεῦμα here. The instances quoted show that πνεῦμα was used in figurative expressions referring to relationship, destiny and attitude, but not that the word itself had acquired this secondary meaning.

2. Air breathed (in or out), breath of a living being, man or animal. This usage is frequent in all the major writers from Aeschylus onwards.<sup>2</sup> Aesch. Eum. 568, ἑλπίγῃ βροταίου πνεύματος πληρουμένη "a trumpet filled with mortal breath": in Eur. Phoen. 787, the breath breathed through a tube is called λωτοῦ πνεύματα (cf. Bacch. 128, αὐλῶν πνεύματι). In Plato Tim. 78a-b πνεῦμα is thought of as taken into the body by respiration (cf. Arist. de Respir. 473a, 3-4). Scarcely

I "Ist fast nicht zu unterscheiden ob dem dichterischen Bild vom Geist und der Atmosphäre religiöser Rechtlichkeit und Scheu mehr die physikalische Anschauung und Realität Wind (des Landes) oder mehr die physiologischen Atem (seiner Bewohner) zugrunde liegt", TWNT, VI, pp.334-5 (H. Kleinknecht)

2 Whether "breath" or "wind" is the first sense cannot be decided on the basis of occurrence: both are present as early as Aeschylus.



distinguishable from the idea of "breath" is that of "air" as available for breathing: Eur. Hel. 867, ὡς πνεῦμα καθαρὸν οὐρανοῦ δεξώμεθα "That we may receive the pure air of heaven". Polyb. Hist. 24.8d may belong here: οἴκημα κατάγειον οὔτε πνεῦμα λαμβάνον οὔτε φῶς "a subterranean chamber receiving neither air nor light". The word denotes "air" as necessary to life (yet not precisely "the breath of life") in Plato Tim. 77a, τὴν ζωὴν ἐν πυρὶ καὶ πνεύματι συνέβαινεν "life depends on fire and air". At 84d-e in the same dialogue πνεῦμα seems to refer to the air in the various parts of the body which is furnished to these parts by the lungs, themselves called ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων τῷ σώματι ταμίης .

3. In some passages (scattered over a considerable period of time) πνεῦμα has the meaning "breath of life", "life" and even more generally "the basic principle of life". This is sometimes expressed by πνεῦμα βίου (Aesch. Pers. 507, εὐτυχὴς τοι ὅστις τάχιστα πνεῦμ' ἀπέρρηξεν βίου ) although, in the same period, we find πνεῦμα itself bearing this meaning: Aesch. Theb. 981, σωθεὶς δὲ πνεῦμα ἀπώλεσεν "he lost his life" and Eur. Orest. 864, πνεῦμ' ἀπορρηῆξαι με δεῖ "I must die" (cf. Eur. Hec. 571 and Polyb. Hist. 13.1a.2).

Of interest are two fragments from Epicharmus, a contemporary of Sophocles.

No. 126. Συνεκρίθη καὶ διεκρίθη κάπηλθεν ὅθεν ἦλθεν πάλιν, γὰρ μὲν εἰς γὰρ, πνεῦμα δ' ἄνω : joined it was, is now severed and is gone again whence it came; earth to earth, and "spirit" above.



No. 146. Ἐυσεβῆς νόῳ πεφυκὼς οὐ πάθοις κ' οὐδὲν  
κακὸν καταθανὼν· ἔνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμενεῖ κατ'  
οὐρανόν : if with pious mind thou shouldest live,  
thou wouldest suffer no ill at death: above the  
spirit will continue to exist in heaven. (Quot.  
from Diels, Die Frag. der Vorsok., 3 Auf. I, p.122).

It is difficult to know exactly the meaning of πνεῦμα in these two passages. Possibly the reference is to the "breath of life" (rather than the "spirit") being re-absorbed in the universal πνεῦμα i.e. the air or soul-substance. A statement similar to that of Epicharmus appears at Eur. Suppl. 532-4, ὅθεν δ' ἕκαστον ἐς τὸ σῶμ' ἀφίκετο / ἐνταῦθα ἀπῆλθε, πνεῦμα μὲν πρὸς αἰθέρα / τὸ σῶμα δ' ἐς γῆν. Editors agree in not ascribing these lines to Euripides, and Stobaeus Florileg. 123.3 attributes them to Moschion, 2nd cent. A.D., but their meaning is clear: everything returns to its origin the body to the earth and the "spirit" to the air, the "spirit" itself being the breath of life, the air by which men live.

Xenophanes (6th cent. B.C.) is said by Diogenes Laertius (IX, Xen. 3) to have been the first to declare that the soul (ψυχή) is πνεῦμα : πρῶτος τ' ἀπεφήνατο ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον φθαρτὸν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πνεῦμα. The context leads one to suspect that by this statement Xenophanes did not mean that the soul is "spirit", but rather that (as against the views of his predecessors who maintained that the ψυχή lives after death as a shade) everything which comes into being is also subject to extinction, and that,



under this general law, the soul also is merely "air" or "breath". Plutarch (Plac. Phil. 1.3) ascribes to Anaximenes, a contemporary of Xenophanes, the statement: οἶον ἡ ψυχὴ, φῆσι, ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀήρ οὔσα συγκρατεῖ ἡμᾶς, καὶ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον πνεῦμα καὶ ἀήρ περιέχει : "as our soul, being air, controls (or holds together) us, so wind (?) and air encompass the whole world". While πνεῦμα is not here predicated of ἡ ψυχὴ, yet it is evident that πνεῦμα and ἀήρ are almost synonymous terms. Aristotle uses the expression σύμφυτον πνεῦμα to denote "air" that belongs in, or is born in the body, as distinguished from that which is inhaled (de Part. Anim. 659b, 17-19).<sup>1</sup>

It appears then that from the 6th century B.C.

πνεῦμα was predicated of the soul, meaning a substance identical with or akin to "air", and that, from the time of Sophocles at least, the idea of life was associated with the term. In Epicharmus, it denotes "soul substance", and by the time of Pseudo-Aristotle, the notion has so expanded that πνεῦμα comes to signify the basis of all life. In none of the passages cited, however, is the term individualised so as to denote the "soul" of a person, or the "human spirit" conceived of as the seat or organ of psychic life.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pseud. Arist. Mund. 394b uses πνεῦμα to denote a substance in both plants and animals, which permeates all living things, i.e. as a universal principle of life or existence. The passage is probably much later than Aristotle's work.

<sup>2</sup> This the connotation of ψυχὴ .



Πνεῦμα remains a term of substance, meaning spirit in a non-individualised sense, a substance constituting (according to some writers) the soul, and (according to others) a sort of reservoir of soul stuff or life-principle.

In the late Greek authors the word πνεῦμα retains the meanings "wind", "breath of life, life" and "air". Dionysius of Halicarnassus witnesses to its use, by metonymy, to mean "energy or forcefulness" in speech: διὰ-λεκτος ... πνεύματος ... ἐλαχίστην ἔχουσα μοῖραν . He also uses the word to mean "a spirit": τὴν γυναῖκα ... δαιμονίῳ πνεύματι κατέσχετον γενομένην (Antiq.1.31). This usage is attested by the LXX (1 Sam.16:23, 1 Kings 22:21) for a period earlier than Dion.Hal., but this appears to be the first example of its use in this sense in non-Jewish Greek literature.

The Stoics made much use of the term πνεῦμα . The early representatives of that school still employed the word to mean "wind". Stobaeus (Eccl. 1.17) says that Chrysippus defined the ultimate reality as πνεῦμα , or air endowed with the power of self-motion,<sup>1</sup> not simply "air in motion" as in the earlier writers. As predicated of the ψυχὴ , πνεῦμα means, not the "perishable breath" as in Xenophanes, nor "inner matter", but "soul-stuff" which, while material,

<sup>1</sup> "The self-existent is πνεῦμα moving itself to itself and from itself, or πνεῦμα moving itself to and fro (εἶναι τὸ ὄν πνεῦμα κινεῖν ἑαυτὸ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἢ πνεῦμα ἑαυτὸ κινεῖν πρόσω καὶ ὀπίσω )."



is also, by virtue of its permeation by λόγος , active: its activity within (as πνεῦμα σύμφυτον ἡμῖν , so Chrysippus) is the extension of itself from the governing soul to the organs of sense-perception (πνεύματα νοερά ), as a vital nervous fluid.

So far as we know Posidonius was the first among the Greeks to say that God was πνεῦμα , to which characterisation he added νοερόν καὶ πυρῶδες , the latter adj. suggesting that the notion of material still adhered to the term.<sup>1</sup> Two hundred years before Posidonius, Menander (frag. 482) uses the phrase πνεῦμα θεῖον of Τυχῇ in such a way as to suggest that some of his contemporaries employed the term to designate the power controlling human affairs, but how far it was individualised or personalised is far from clear. In the Pseudo-Platonic Axiochus 370c we read that there is in the soul some divine breath ( θεῖον ... ἐνῇν πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ ) through which it possesses intelligence and knowledge. The context makes it obvious that the notion is of "divine inspiration"<sup>2</sup> residing in the ψυχῇ . Again, there is no evidence of the personalising of πνεῦμα , and, in fact, it would seem that πνεῦμα remains, till the end of

<sup>1</sup> Stobaeus Ec.1.1. "God is air, intelligent, fiery, not having form, but changing into what it will and assimilating itself to all things (πνεῦμα νοερόν καὶ πυρῶδες, οὐκ ἔχον μὲν μορφὴν, μεταβάλλον δὲ εἰς ὃ βούλεται καὶ συνεξομοιούμενον πᾶσιν)".

<sup>2</sup> This use is known from other passages: see LS, πνεῦμα III. for references.



the first Christian century, a name of the substance, refined, ethereal, penetrating the whole ocosmos (anima mundi) but not yet immaterial, the substance of which God and the human soul<sup>1</sup> are composed: it denotes neither the human spirit nor personal divine spirit.

### III. The Usage of the Septuagint

The Septuagint translators reveal a strong tendency to render the Hebrew word  $\square \cdot 17$  by  $\piνεῦμα$  <sup>2</sup> and this in spite of the fact that the Hebrew term had a wider range of meanings than the Greek. The survey of Greek usage has shown that  $\piνεῦμα$  covered the meanings "wind", "breath of life" and "air" but did not denote "spirit", either human or divine: in Biblical Greek the use of the term was widened to include this meaning.

#### 1. The use of $\piνεῦμα$ for "wind" and "breath".

In many of the instances where  $\square \cdot 17$  clearly denotes "wind" the translators chose to render it by  $\acute{\alpha}νεμος$  rather than by  $\piνεῦμα$  (Ex.10:13,19; 14:21, 2 Kings 22:11 etc). This occurs about fifty times, more than one-third of the total number of times that  $\square \cdot 17$  means "wind". There seems, however to be no real distinction in the meanings of  $\acute{\alpha}νεμος$  and  $\piνεῦμα$ .

1 Plut. de prim. fug. 2.5: οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ καὶ τὸ  $\piνεῦμα$  λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς σώμασι τῶν βρεφῶν τῇ περιψύξει στομοῦσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλον ἐκ φύσεως γίνεσθαι ψυχὴν 1.0. ... is hardened by cooling and being changed by the process of generation becomes soul.

2 Baumgärtel (TWNT, VI,  $\piνεῦμα$  in LXX) reckons that of the 378 occurrences of  $\square \cdot 17$ , 277 are rendered in the LXX by  $\piνεῦμα$



when applied to "wind" (cf. Num. 11:31, Ezek. 13:11, Amos 4:13): if the terms are not identical, they are at least closely synonymous. On a few occasions when  $\square\cdot 17$  means "wind" the translators have either paraphrased the original or misunderstood it (Jer. 10:13, 51:16 LXX 28:16) and neither  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  nor  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  appears in their text. At Ezek. 13:13  $\square\cdot 17$  ("wind") is rendered by  $\pi\nu\omicron\acute{\eta}$ .

When  $\square\cdot 17$  denotes "breath" it is almost always translated by  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ . The ruach of the nostrils of Yahweh appears as  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  in Ex. 15:8, 2 Sam. 22:16, Ps. 18:16, and Ps. 104(3):29-30 reads;

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma,\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ldots$   
 $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$

The phrase  $\square\cdot 17\text{-}\square\cdot 17\text{-}\square\cdot 17$  at Gen. 7:22 appears as  $\pi\nu\omicron\acute{\eta}\ \xi\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ . In view of the fact that  $\square\cdot 17$  at Gen. 6:17, 7:15 is translated by  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \xi\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ , it is possible that  $\pi\nu\omicron\acute{\eta}\ \xi\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  point to a reading  $\square\cdot 17\text{-}\square\cdot 17$ .<sup>1</sup> Occasionally, even  $\pi\eta\upsilon\psi\text{-}\square\cdot 17$  ("breath") is rendered by  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  (3 Kings 17:17, Job 34:14, Dan. 5:23 where Theod. has  $\pi\nu\omicron\acute{\eta}$ , and Dan. 10:17 where Theod. has  $\pi\nu\omicron\acute{\eta}$ ): this is a sign of the extent to which the meaning "breath" was identified with the use of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ .

## 2. The use of $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ for "spirit".

The Greeks possessed nothing that corresponded to the Hebrew conception of the Spirit of God, and it is not strange

<sup>1</sup> But see p. 460, note 2, above.



therefore that they lacked a means of expressing it. The LXX translators simply extended the use of πνεῦμα to cover this meaning of רוּחַ as well, and they did so quite consistently. The charismatic רוּחַ רוּחַ, as experienced (temporarily) by warrior and prophet, and as the permanent endowment of the prophets, the Messianic king and as the regenerating, recreating power in the future community, is consistently rendered by τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that when discussing the OT idea of the Spirit of God, we pointed out that the "spirit" is not really distinct from Yahweh, is not an agent with its own existence and action, but rather the divine power entering into action. Now it is impossible to discover on the basis of usage alone whether the word πνεῦμα (rendering רוּחַ in this sense) preserves the Hebrew idea or whether it suggests some kind of power or personality separable from God. Ordinary Greek usage, as we have seen, appears to have consistently understood πνεῦμα as denoting substance. Did something of this conception pass over into the term "spirit of God" as it was interpreted from the Greek Bible by Greek speakers? In other words, did the possibility of regarding the Spirit as independent of God enter because of the connotation πνεῦμα possessed for the Greek mind? Some passages suggest that this may be so. The important verse in Ps.51 "take not from Gen. 1:2 reads, πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπ' ὕδατος not τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ .



me thy holy spirit (  $\eta\psi\eta\eta\eta$  )" lit. the spirit of thy holiness, becomes  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$  , a rendering which may imply a degree of distinction between "spirit" and the source of the gift which the Hebrew would not support. At Is. 63:10-11 the same change is at work. In 1 Sam. 16:14 ("an evil spirit from the Lord,  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$  ") and 1 Kings 22:21f. ("the lying spirit,  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  ") there is present in the Greek a suggestion of separate identity, even of many spirits under the control of God. What may have been implicit in the Hebrew becomes explicit in the Greek version. Further evidence for the idea of "spirits" with separate existence is found in the translation of Num. 16:22, 27:16. The Hebrew reads "God of the spirits of all flesh", i.e. God of the vital breath or life of all men: the Greek has  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omega\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$  where the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$  are probably "spirits" acting as God's messengers.<sup>1</sup> On discovering renderings of this kind, one wonders if we have here (in the Greek translation) the beginnings of the conception of possession by spirits and the source of the later use of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$  to describe beings surrounding God, akin to the elohim and angels in the OT.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. Bieder (TENT) suggests that the LXX rendering of Num. 16:22 shows how ideas associated with the Creation narrative have affected the translation, in bringing to expression the separateness of earthly material from the heavenly world.

<sup>2</sup> The 'elohim and angels of the OT were not called "spirits" there. A.H. Johnson (The One and the Many, p.16) thinks that the "evil spirits", like the elohim and angels, should be



3. When  $\square 17$  is used in the "psychical" sense, as the seat of the affections, passions and will etc., there is considerable variation in the translation. Only about half of the passages in which this sense of  $\square 17$  occurs are rendered by πνεῦμα . This is hardly surprising in view of the fact that in Greek a psychological use of the word πνεῦμα does not occur. To obviate this difficulty the translators resorted to several expedients. They sometimes used ("soul"), as at Gen.41:8, Ex. 35:21, or some form of that word, ὀλιγοψυχία (Ex. 6:9), ὀλιγόψυχος (Is. 54:6, 57:15; Prov. 14:29, 18:14). More often they used θύμος (Job 15:13, Prov. 18:14, 29:11, Zech. 6:8, Is. 59:19, Ezek. 39:29) or some form of that word, e.g. μακρόθυμος , -ία , πραῦθυμος , θυμοῦν . Several terms appear once to render  $\square 17$  in this sense: ἡσυχίος Is. 66:2 ("contrite in spirit"), ταπεινόφρων , Prov. 29:23, κακοφροσύνη , Prov. 16:18, φρόνησις , Jos.5:1 and νοῦς: Is.40:13 ("Who has directed the spirit of the Lord" becomes τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου ; ). Occasionally a different expression was substituted for the Hebrew (Ps. 32:2, Prov. 15:13) thus avoiding a direct translation of the word. So consistently did the translator of the book of Proverbs use these expedients that only once, 15:4, does πνεῦμα appear where  $\square 17$  regarded as individualisations within the corporate  $\square 17$  of Y's. extended personality. This idea preserves the notion of personality to these extensions, but may increase the measure of their separability from Y. On the Heavenly Court, see G.E. Wright, The Old Testament against its Environment, (London, 1950) pp. 30ff.



stands in the Hebrew - and there he has misunderstood the meaning of the passage! But it is well-known that the translator of Proverbs (and of Job) was more alive to Greek usage and ideas<sup>1</sup> and therefore it is not surprising to find variety and a measure of precision in the psychological terms he employs.

#### IV. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

In general, the usage of πνεῦμα in these writings is the same as that in the Greek translations of the canonical books, but some developments make a survey of the literature valuable.

1. πνεῦμα is used for "wind" in the translated books, Sir. 39:28, 43:17, Song of Three 27,43 (Dan. 3:50, 65); and in the Greek works, Wisdom 6:11, 23;7:20(?), 11:20(?), 13:2, 17:18 and Ep.Jer.61. The writers still emphasize the power of the wind, especially its destructive force, and affirm that it is under the control of God (Sir. 43:17).

2. Illustrations of the use of πνεῦμα for "breath" and "the breath of life" may be found in almost all the books of this literature: Sir. 38:23 (ἐν ἐξόδῳ πνεύματος means "death"), Tob. 3:6 (Heb. 'שׁוּחַ), Jud. 14:6, 10:13 (πνεῦμα ζωῆς means "a life"), Bar. 2:17; Wisd. 2:3, 15:11,16, 16:14; Ep.Jer.24, 2 Mac.7:22,23 (πνεῦμα καὶ ζωή), 3 Mac. 6:24, 4 Mac.11:11,12:

<sup>1</sup> See G. Gerleman, Studies in the Septuagint, Proverbs (Lund, 1956).



When the breath departs, the man dies (Sir. 38:23, Wisd.2:3, Jud. 14:16): the "breath" is borrowed from God during life (Wisd. 15:11,16) and God can call it away at any time (Tob. 3:6). After death God can restore it to man so that he may live again (2 Mac. 7:23, 14:46). In none of these passages is there any clear evidence that the personality of man himself was identified with the breath or spirit (πνεῦμα). At Jud. 16:14 (cf. Enoch 14:2) the πνεῦμα (of God) is equivalent to the Word of God in the action of Creation: "Thou didst speak and they were made: thou didst send forth thy spirit (πνεῦμα) and it builded them". Once, πνεῦμα is used, by metonymy, for the "living person": Dan. 3:86 (Song of Three, 84), "Bless the Lord, ye spirits (πνεύματα) and souls of the righteous". This is one of a series of invocations appealing to various classes of living men: therefore it refers to the living righteous, not to departed spirits.

3. The phrase "spirit of God" is not frequent in the Inter-testamental literature. Apart from Jud. 16:14, where the πνεῦμα of God is equated with the power of the Word in Creation, the divine Spirit is always associated with "wisdom" in these writings:

Who ever gained knowledge of thy counsel, except thou gavest wisdom (σοφία) and sentest thy holy spirit from on high (τὸ ἅγιον σου πνεῦμα) Wisd. 9:17.

I prayed and understanding (φρόνησις) was given to me; I called on God and there came to me a spirit of wisdom. Wisd. 7:7.



Wisdom is a holy spirit of discipline or instruction (ἅγιον πνεῦμα παιδείας ) which flees deceit (1:5): it is a spirit that loveth man (1:6), and a spirit of understanding (Sir. 39:6). Yet, according to Wisd. 7:22ff "in wisdom there is a spirit, quick of understanding, holy, subtle etc., penetrating all things", where "spirit" appears to be used in a descriptive, qualitative way.

In so far as there was a hypostatization of "wisdom" in the Sapiential literature, the same tendency appears to have affected πνεῦμα θεοῦ : it is drawn towards the idea of substance in the Alexandrian theology. "The spirit of the Lord has filled the inhabited world, that which holdeth all things together (τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα ) hath knowledge of every voice" (Wisd. 1:7), and at 12:1, "Thine incorruptible spirit is in all things (ἀφθαρτον πνεῦμα )", and for this reason God spares life. These passages suggest some formless, all-penetrating being or material substance, pervading the whole universe (cf. the Stoic world-spirit). On the other hand, "spirit", like "wisdom", may denote divine power, active particularly (so the Wisdom writers say) in the sphere of the intellect, the power which enables the righteous to know and to accomplish the will of God, i.e. a divine activity in morality and knowledge. This is the function of the spirit. The good man experiences it or shares in it (Test.Sim.4:4, Benj.8:2). The



Messiah was expected to possess the spirit in fulness:

God will cause him to be mighty in holy spirit  
(ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) and wise in the counsel of  
understanding with strength and righteousness Ps. Sol.  
17:37. cf. 18:7.

1

There is no reference here to a personal being. The Psalms of Solomon stand in the main stream of Jewish thinking and reveal the theme of endowment by the power of God for a special task (cf. Sir. 48:12,24.).

4. The use of πνεῦμα for "personal spirits" is almost entirely confined to the Book of Enoch, Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

(a) The angelic beings who had their home in heaven and left it to consort with mortal women are called "spirits" (πνεύματα), En.15:4-8: they are capable of assuming many different forms, and some of them are said to have sinned "in spirit".<sup>2</sup> In the Ethiopic portion of Enoch the phrase "Lord of Spirits" (found 104 times, of which 28 are in interpolated passages) seems to take the place of the older "Lord of Hosts" and the two titles may reflect a kinship of ideas concerning the powers under the control of God.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Test. Levi 18:7 "the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him", i.e. the Messiah: also En. 49:3-2 "In him (the Elect One) dwells the spirit of wisdom".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Chapter 20:6.

<sup>3</sup> The title ΠΙΣΤΥ ΠΙΠ' was frequently translated in the LXX by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, which may suggest the idea of lordship over divine agencies: see C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp.16-17. In 2 Mac.3:24 God is called ὁ πᾶν πνευμάτων καὶ πατρὸς ἐξουσίας δυνάστης.



(b) The giants, who were born of the union of angels with human kind, are "evil spirits", and from them, at their death, go forth evil spirits (En. 15:8-12; 16:1). These spirits are demons, living on earth without restraint, and tormenting living persons until the day of consummation, the great Judgment. This demonology is found in the Book of Jubilees, in which a well organised Satanic kingdom ruled over by the prince Mastema stands over against the angelic kingdom. As in Enoch, the demons are the spirits which went forth from the slain children of the angels ("Watchers") and the daughters of men. There is a vast demonology in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Acting under the rule of Beliar or the Devil, the "spirits of deceit" (the most common designation) are concerned primarily with the temptation of men. Test.Reub.2:1-2 and 3:3-6 mentions "seven spirits of deceit" (fornication, insatiableness, fighting etc.) which appear to be the inclinations to various sins, located in the various organs of the body. T.Jud.20:1 claims that two spirits wait upon man, the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit, and the works of both are written upon the hearts of men and each one of them is known by the Lord. T.Asher 1:3ff varies the same theme, and instead of "spirits" speaks of "inclinations":

If the soul takes pleasure in the good (inclination) all its actions are in righteousness, if it inclines to the evil, all its actions are in wickedness and .. it is ruled by Beliar. (cf. T. Benj. 6:1).



The Messiah will make war on Beliar and will take from him the captive souls (T. Dan. 5:10) and Beliar will be bound and cast into the fire. T. Reub. 2:3-3:2 is a late Greek interpolation concerning the seven bodily senses. The word πνεύματα is used here (in a sense strange to [17] ) to denote the sense organs or appetites. This use of is found in stoic philosophy, in which the five senses, plus the power of reproduction and speech, discharge themselves into the body in the form of immaterial currents, πνεύματα (Plut. de Plac. 4:21, Philo Opif. 40). Once in Tobit 6:7, a demon inhabiting a human being is called π. πονηρόν

(c) A new meaning for πνεῦμα - "a human spirit after death" - is found in Enoch 9:3, 10; 20:3. With this sense the term seems to be used as a synonym of ψυχή , and in ch. 22 the two words are used interchangeably. In using the word πνεῦμα in this way the author may have been influenced by his own application of it to the "spirits" which proceeded from the dead giants. However, these "spirits" of dead men were not free to roam about like the "spirits" of the giants: instead they were confined to underground places to await the final judgment. The abode of the "spirits" of the righteous was a place with light and water in it, while that of evil men was made for torture and pain. While it is clear that in the Book of Enoch πνεῦμα is thus used as a synonym of ψυχή , designating the disembodied personality of man after death,



yet it does not seem that the innovation of usage was followed by any other writer of the period.

5. The use of  $\piνεῦμα$  in the "psychical" sense (denoting the seat of affections and emotions) is not common in the Intertestamental literature and is almost non-existent in the books composed in Greek. This is further evidence that among Greek-speaking people there was no such meaning in use. There are, however, several instances in the books which translate a Hebrew original. The "spirit" ( $\piνεῦμα$ ) i.e. courage, of the people revived when they selected Simeon as their leader, 1 Mac. 13:7: God changed the spirit of Ahasuerus into mildness towards Esther (Gk. addition to Esther 15:10): the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus to make a proclamation (1 Esdr. 2:2) and the spirit of the priest and Levites to build the temple at Jerusalem (2:8). The "spirit" ( $\piνεῦμα$ ) is the seat of excitement and impulse (Sir.9:9), of anxiety (Bar.3:1), of humility (song of Three, 16) and of fear (Jud. 7:19). These examples of the use of  $\piνεῦμα$  are interpretable only in the light of the "psychical" use of  $רוח$  in the Old Testament.

#### V. Philo Judaeus

In the voluminous writings of Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, the word  $\piνεῦμα$  is not so frequent as one would expect, appearing about 110 times, whereas  $\psiυχη$  occurs about seventeen times as often. Despite the fact that  $\piνεῦμα$  is not a



leading term with Philo, it is important in itself, as well as throwing valuable light on the use of the word in the Alexandrian philosophy at a time coincident with the period of the writing of some of the New Testament documents.

Philo uses the word πνεῦμα (sing. and pl.) for "wind" over forty times. It is applied both to violent blasts and gentle breezes, though more often to the former. The old Jewish idea of the wind as under the direct control of God seems to be entirely abandoned, presumably because Philo had adopted the Greek conceptions of physical nature. This suggestion is borne out by his use of πνεῦμα to denote one of the elemental substances. Associated with "heaven" "earth" and "water" (Ebr. 106, Sac.97) πνεῦμα means "air", the air we breathe which is life-giving (Opif. 29-30) and is equivalent to ζήρ (Gig.10, Cher.111 and cf. Leg. All. 1.91). To denote "breath" (both human and animal) Philo employs πνεῦμα eleven times. "Breath", being part of the air outside, is inhaled through the nostrils and mouth (Legat.18) and travels through the wind-pipe (Immut.84). The activity of breathing, inhalation, is ὄλκος πνεύματος (Mos.1.93): this may be spasmodic, because of intense emotion (Legat.188, 243) and may be cut off (ἀποκοπή πνεύματος, Spec, Leg. 1.338).

In harmony with Stoic thought and expression, Philo uses πνεῦμα occasionally of the permeating and building force within physical bodies: Immut. 35 "Cohesion (ἑξις )



in stones and wood is a breath or current ( πνεῦμα ) ever returning to itself": Opif. 131 - the earth is bound together by the power of, or by virtue of, the life-breath(?) that makes it one ( πνεύματος ἐνωτικῆς δυνάμει ) and by moisture: Fug.182: the dominant faculty in the soul "waters the face, which is the dominant part of the body, extending to the eyes the spirit (or current) of vision, that of hearing to the ears ( τὸ μὲν ὁρατικόν πνεῦμα τείνοντος εἰς ὄμματα, τὸ δὲ ἀκουστικόν εἰς οὖς )" and so on, with the various senses which are faculties of the irrational soul.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to find any satisfactory English equivalent for the Stoic πνεῦμα , that immaterial force, akin to the element of air, and associated with the principle of cohesion in the body and with the power of sense-perception.

As well as to denote the activity of the senses,

πνεῦμα is used sometimes by Philo as equivalent to reason or mind ( νοῦς ).<sup>2</sup> Fug.134 speaks of νοῦς as ἔνθερμον καὶ πεπυρῶμενον πνεῦμα : more important is Deter.83, "To that

<sup>1</sup> We noted earlier, in connection with T.Reub.2:3-3:2, the use in Stoic philosophy of πνεύματα to describe the sense and the powers of reproduction and speech.

<sup>2</sup> This use of πνεῦμα links it to one aspect of ψυχή. On the one hand, ψυχή, when applied to man, possesses the vital energy, the principle of life in matter, irrational and common to men and animals: the essence of this vital principle is blood (Lev. 17:11) and life according to it is, opposed to the life of reason. On the other hand, ψυχή possesses a rational capacity, the impress of the divine reason, and, being described as "breathed into man by God", it is called πνεῦμα : it may also be named νοῦς or λόγος since it is an undivided part of the divine Reason.



faculty which we share with irrational things (τὰ ἄλογα ) blood was assigned as its substance, but that flowing from the fountain of reason has for its substance breath (πνεῦμα ), not air set in motion (i.e. not just "air" or "wind") but a sort of stamp and impress of the divine power. . . the εἰκὼν, showing that God is the archetype of rational nature and man its copy..<sup>1</sup> That is to say (in the words of J. Drummond), "the Spirit which forms the essence of man's rational soul is the impress of the Logos".<sup>2</sup> The scriptural proof-text for this idea is Gen.2:7, "And the Lord God breathed into his face a breath of life".<sup>3</sup> We have already mentioned Philo's application of πνεῦμα ("breath") to the irrational soul,<sup>4</sup> but here we have it applied to the rational soul, the image or impress of the Divine reason.<sup>5</sup> It is the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. πνεῦμα λόγικον at Spec. Leg. 1.171, 277.

<sup>2</sup> Drummond, Philo Judaeus, Vol. 2 p.215.

<sup>3</sup> The LXX uses πνοή here. In quoting the verse Philo uses πνοή 5 times and πνεῦμα twice, as if the words were interchangeable. Yet in Leg. All. 1.42 he distinguishes between them: πνεῦμα he says, applies to the rational mind when conceived as something created "after the image and idea", i.e. after the idea of mind, without reference to its connection with the irrational soul. The term πνοή refers to the rational mind, when conceived as connected with the irrational soul created of matter.

<sup>4</sup> Opif. 67: Nature distributes the "breathlike substance" (πνευματική οὐσία ) to the faculties of the irrational soul, namely the nutritive and the sensitive (θρεπτικὸν, αἰσθητικὸν ). This is an Aristotelian division. Cf. Frag. on Gen. 9:4, "in real truth, the breath ( πνεῦμα ) rather than the blood is the essence of the soul", i.e. the irrational soul. See H. A. Wolfson, Philo, vol.1, pp.385ff.

<sup>5</sup> Wolfson, op.cit., p.394: "In its application to the irrational soul, the term "breath" is of Stoic origin and it



essence of the "governing element" in human nature and is identified with λογισμός ("reason") at Heres 55-57, where Philo contrasts men who live by reason, the divine in-breathing (θεῖον πνεῦμα ) and those who live by the blood and the pleasure of the flesh. In Plant. 18 Philo speaks, in notable terms, of the "rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχὴ )" of man as "the genuine coinage (νομίσμα ) of that divine and invisible spirit (πνεῦμα ), marked and stamped by the seal of God, whose impress is the eternal Logos". In this quotation, we observe that the term πνεῦμα θεῖον (as well as πνεῦμα ) can be used to describe the incorporeal and rational soul breathed into man. The same use is found at Opif. 135 where it is said that men were made from γεῶδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θείου , and at Spec. Log. 4, 123, ἐκείνης (i.e. ψυχῆς λογικῆς ) γὰρ οὐσία πνεῦμα θεῖον .

There is another use of πνεῦμα θεῖον in Philo. In order to understand its place in his scheme we must recall that man's rational soul (the λογικὴ ψυχὴ whose substance is πνεῦμα or πνεῦμα θεῖον ) is not conceived by Philo as having any knowledge of its own: it has only a capacity for knowledge, and that capacity may be fulfilled in one of two ways: the soul may take data of the external world supplied to it by the senses and transform them, by its native power, into rational concepts, or, by freeing means something corporeal; in its application to mind it is of scriptural origin and it means something incorporeal".



itself from the bodily influence and from its own rational concepts based on sense-perception, the incorporeal soul may become filled with "divine spirit" (or prophetic spirit) and through this receive a new kind of knowledge, a knowledge of things incorporeal, i.e. a supernatural order of rational knowledge.

The mind is indeed buoyant and raised to the utmost height by the native force of the divine Spirit overcoming in boundless might all powers here below (τῇ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος καὶ πάντα δυνατοῦ καὶ τὰ κάτω νικῶντος φύσει ). Plant. 24.

According to one usage, the air that flows up from the land is called πνεῦμα θεῖον (Gen.1:2).... but according to another, it means that pure knowledge (ἀκέραιος ἐπιστήμη ) in which every wise man fully shares. Sig. 22f.

In this use of πνεῦμα θεῖον in connection with inspiration there are echoes of both Stoic and Platonic ideas and terminology, but Philo is also sensitive to the OT idea of the "spirit" as a divine equipment, a divine endowment which is not identifiable with the natural endowment, also called the inbreathing of the πνεῦμα .<sup>1</sup> This aspect of the "divine spirit" is illustrated by the special equipment of wisdom and understanding bestowed on Bezaleel for the construction of the Tabernacle, and by the imparting to the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 127, "The conception of this special form of πνεῦμα seems to be required on the one hand by philosophy, in order to account for the fact that some men have a knowledge and intellectual power which others have not, and, on the other hand, by theology, since the Pentateuch speaks of men being filled, in some special sense, by a divine Spirit".



Seventy elders of the spirit of Moses. This spirit is "wise, divine, excellent ... not severed or divided, diffused in fulness through all things: the spirit which helps ( ὁφελούv ) but suffers no hurt, which, though shared with others or added to others, suffers no diminution in understanding, wisdom and knowledge", Gig.24ff. It is like a fire which, though many other fires be kindled from it, remains itself alive. This spirit leads the mind to truth (Mos.2.265): it is the author of inspiration (Somm. 2.262, Mos.1.175,297) and takes over from reason the control of man (Spec. Leg.4.49, Heres 265). It is not, however, a permanent gift. The Biblical statement "My spirit shall not dwell with man for ever, because they are flesh ( σὰρξ )", Gen.6:3, is interpreted of the divine inspiring power which remains only temporarily with men, because men (as flesh) do not always desire or receive a notion ( ἐννοία ) of the Highest. "Nothing" says Philo (Immut.2) "is harder than that it should abide for ever in the soul with its manifold divisions and forms, the soul which has fastened on it the grievous burden of this fleshly coil". Nevertheless, the divine spirit may be encouraged to remain. "Let us keep from wrong-doing in order that the divine spirit of wisdom may not easily remove and depart, but may abide with us a long time, as with Moses" (Gig.47). Only with one type of man does the divine spirit dwell, namely, he who has



stripped off all that belongs to the world of becoming,  
 "and with unrestricted and open mind reaches God" (Orig.53).<sup>1</sup>

At this point an important question may be raised. What is the relation between πνεῦμα θεῖον as the essence of the rational (incorporeal) soul of man and πνεῦμα θεῖον in the sense of prophetic spirit? No clear solution of this problem appears in Philo's writings, but it seems that the connection must be sought in their relation to the Logos.<sup>2</sup> The πνεῦμα θεῖον which forms the essence of the rational soul is the impress of the Logos: it is the communicated divine idea, the imitation or the share which each man enjoys of the universal Reason; in short, the πνεῦμα θεῖον, as rational soul, is the Logos immanent in man. As the inspiring endowment of man, πνεῦμα θεῖον is identified with Wisdom in its highest sense ("that pure knowledge in which every wise man shares") and is therefore indistinguishable from the Logos, which, by this endowment of itself, is manifested in varying degrees in individual men. In uniting philosophical thought with Jewish teaching, Philo sets forth the idea that the source of the possibility of the life of reason is essentially the same as the divine endowment which inspires and equips for noble living.

<sup>1</sup> See H.A.A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion. (London, 1919) pp.186ff.

<sup>2</sup> On this see H.A. Wolfson, op.cit., vol. 2 p.30, J. Drummond op.cit., vol.2, p.214-16, and H.A.A. Kennedy, op.cit., p.188.



In short, Philo suggests that rational living and spirit-inspired living are two ways of expressing the actualisation of the one reality.

By way of summary, we may say that in the works of Philo πνεῦμα is used of "wind", the element "air" and "human breath"; of the cohesive force in physical bodies and of the power of sense-perception (both Stoic ideas); as the inbreathing of God in creation, it is the essence of the rational soul of man, the stamp of the Logos: this soul is also called πνεῦμα θεῖον, a term which also denotes the source of inspired, prophetic knowledge, identifiable with Wisdom and Logos.

## VI. The Rabbinic Literature

As the introduction to the survey of the Rabbinic usage - which will be concerned mainly with קדוש הרוח "Holy Spirit" - we may draw attention to the Targumic interpretation of some of the important texts dealt with in the OT section of this work.

When discussing Gen.1:2, "the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים hovered over the face of the deep", we suggested that רוּחַ connoted something more profound than simply "wind", namely, the vitalising energy of God directed in its activity by the divine word. In the opinion of T. Onkelos the phrase is to be understood as "a wind from before God blew upon the face of the waters, וְרוּחָא קִדְמָא יְיָ מְנַשְׁבָּא עַל אַפֵּי מַיָּא", and



-436-

Ibn Ezra considers that "the text makes the wind belong to God, because it was a messenger of his will to dry up the waters". Ps.-Jonathan 1 and 2 on the verse speak of רוח

רוח i.e. "the spirit of mercy from before God" and so discern in the passage the thought that God created the world with mercy.<sup>1</sup> The attribution of cosmic functions to רוח is very infrequent in the OT (Gen. 1:2, Ps.33:6; 104:30) and in the Intertestamental books (Jud. 16:14 and occasionally in association with the action of Wisdom): likewise, among the Rabbis, the spirit is not conceived as the life-giving creative power of God. "In early Rabbinic literature, the 'cosmic' function of the Spirit does not appear to be mentioned at all."<sup>2</sup> There are, however, passages in which the Spirit is spoken of as the re-creating, re-vivifying power of the Messianic age. Ex.R. 48 (102d) distinguishes the functions of the Spirit in this age and in the Age to come:

God said to Israel, "In this world my Spirit has put wisdom in you, but in the future my Spirit will make you to live again, as it is said (Ezek. 37:14) 'I will put my Spirit in you that you may live!'"

The same idea is based on the same text at Gen.R.96 (60d). The Spirit of God was to be the creative power of life in the Age to come, though active, mainly, in the raising up of those who were to share in the Messianic blessings.

<sup>1</sup> SE, I, pp.48-9 and G.F. Moore, Judaism, vol.1 p.389.

<sup>2</sup> E. Schweizer, The Spirit of God (London 1960) p.14.



The use of רוּחַ for "wind" is retained in the Targumim to those passages in which this is the OT meaning. The same is true of the use of the word to denote "breath" and in the various psychological expressions of "spirit". The dependence of mankind upon God for vital breath, expressed in Num.27:16 ("God of the spirits of all flesh") is explained as "The Memra of God who rules over the breath of man and from whom is given the spirit of breath to all flesh, מימרא דה' ושליט בנשמת בר-נש ומניה מתייהב רוח (P. Jon. Num.27:16). In this connection we may mention the strange interpretation of Gen.2:7 "God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and man became a living being, נָפֶשׁ חַיָּה: T. Onkelos says "The breath of life (נִשְׁמַתָּא דְחַיָּי) became in Adam a "discoursing spirit' (רוּחַ מְמַלְכָא)". This interpretation bears witness to the close connection that was thought to exist between "breath" and "word, or speech".

When we turn to the frequent use of רוּחַ and רוּחַ יְהוָה to denote charismatic endowment, we discover that, in Rabbinic interpretation, the character of the gift is predominantly the spirit of prophecy. There are occasions when the endowment is regarded as "power" or "strength" (cf. Targ. Onk. Jud. 13:25 and 1 Sam. 11:6) but the idea of prophetic spirit is unexpectedly common. The gift of the Spirit to the Seventy elders probably means divine inspiration to



govern well, but according to Targ.Ps.-Jon. it refers to the spirit of prophecy (רוח נביא). The spirit upon Samuel (1 Sam.10:6, 16:13 etc.) is the "spirit of prophecy", as is the endowment of Balaam (Num. 24:2). In the record of the comprehensive spiritual enrichment of the Messianic ruler (Is.11:2), in which the "spirit" assumes varied forms to meet varied duties, Tar.Onk. placed first and equivalent to "spirit of the Lord" the phrase "the spirit of prophecy from God".<sup>1</sup> A further example of the association between the divine spirit and prophecy is to be found at Is. 63:10-11 where "spirit of holiness" (רוח קדש) is rendered by "the words of His holy prophets" (מימר נביי

קודש), an interpretation which accords with the Rabbinic inclusion of the patriarchs of Genesis in the category of God's prophets and which makes explicit what we suggested was implicit in the OT passages. This Rabbinic emphasis on the spirit of prophecy requires a widening of the meaning of the word "prophecy". The term is not restricted to the special inspiration to foretell the future and proclaim the divine judgments: it comprises, in this generalised connotation, the possession of deeper insight into the will of God, the infusion into man of a more than ordinary power, knowledge and discernment, enabling him to perform what is right and good more effectually than the

<sup>1</sup> T. Onk. to Is.42:1 does not reinterpret the gift of the Spirit in terms of prophetic endowment.



person who lacks the gift. Thus the "spirit of prophecy" may be attributed to warrior and craftsman, king and Messianic ruler, men whose activities would not all be included within the narrow definition of prophecy.

In addition to being essentially "prophetic spirit" the Holy Spirit was, according to the Rabbis, the inspirer, even the composer of the books of the OT. The Spirit influenced the authors, so that in their writing, they were, to some extent, the passive tools of that Spirit. In such measure is the OT Holy Writ one of the great visible results of the Holy Spirit's activity that the two are regarded as equivalent: a saying from the OT can be quoted either as a saying of Torah or as a saying of the Holy Spirit. However, within this general framework of scriptural inspiration, the Holy Spirit may have a special function in the dramatisation of Biblical verses and passages. Israel or a Biblical character recites part of a verse and Holy Spirit responds by quoting the remainder of the same verse or a neighbouring verse.<sup>1</sup> For example: "Under the apple tree I awakened thee: there thy mother was in travail with thee.": thus far the רוח הקודש speaks, and then the congregation of Israel continues, "Set me as a seal upon thy heart, as a seal upon thy arm", and the Gentile nations conclude "For love is strong as death,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Parzen, "The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature", JQR, XX, (1929-30) pp.56-60, and J. Abelson, The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, (London, 1912) pp.225ff.



-440-

jealousy is cruel as the grave" (Cant. 8:5-6, Tosaf. Sotah 9.9). What is arresting in this usage is the extent to which Holy Spirit is personified. Not only does the Spirit quote verses of Scripture: it also cries, laments, weeps, rejoices, comforts, but always effects these actions by introducing Scriptural quotations. The explanation seems to be that in all this we have a graphic attempt to express the presence and involvement of God in the affairs of his people. The Holy Spirit is the representative of God, and may even be used as a synonym for God speaking in Holy Scripture (Mid.Ex. 15:3, Sif.Deut. 335 on 33:26). Probably the reason for this metonymy, as for the many other Rabbinic substitutes for the actual name of God, is the desire to avoid desecrating the Tetragrammaton, regarded reverently as the proper name of God.

The sanctity of the divine name gave rise to the frequent use of the term "Shekinah" ( שְׁכִינָה ), the Divine presence, and this is often employed interchangeably with "Holy Spirit". What is said in one place about the Shekinah may be said in another place about the "Holy Spirit". Similar phraseology clusters round them both: the sins that drive away the Spirit also drive away the Shekinah: the virtues which qualify one to possess the Holy Spirit also qualify for the Shekinah. That the two terms, having so much in common, were often used indiscriminately



is true, but the term "Holy Spirit" is used far more sparingly in the Rabbinic literature, and where the two are parallel it is found mostly in the later, rather than in the early writings.<sup>1</sup> The exact relation of the two is difficult to determine, but it does not seem right to regard them as identical. While the idea of the abiding presence of God is common to both, there is not attributed to Shekinah the function of revelation or inspiration which is so central to the activity of the Spirit in Jewish thought.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast to the teaching of the OT writers, the Rabbis universalised the gift of the Spirit. In the former it is the endowment only of recognised prophets, of specially prominent individuals and of the Hebrew nation at certain points of its career, but in the thought of the Rabbis and in succeeding Jewish theology, the Holy Spirit may be acquired by anyone who orders his life in accordance with the fear of God.<sup>3</sup> It is not given by Heaven miraculously, i.e. without any sufficiently evident reason; its existence in any individual is the effect of a clear cause. Thus we read: Whoever studies Torah with intent to practise it will merit the gift of the Holy Spirit, הלומר על מנת

לעשות זוכה להקביל ר' ה" (Lev.R.35.7 on 26:3); and R.

<sup>1</sup> Abelson, op.cit., Appendix, p.379.

<sup>2</sup> G.F. Moore, Judaism, vol.1, p.437 and HTR, XV, (1922) p.58.

<sup>3</sup> The idea of the possession of the "spirit of holiness" in Psalm 51 may be moving in this direction.



Nehemiah (140-65 A.D.) says, "Whoever submits to a command in faith is worthy that the Holy Spirit should rest upon him" (Num. R.15.20 on 11:6). In other words, the Holy Spirit is a reward which any man may gain for perseverance in the life of obedience. Naturally, once that Spirit is given, it inspires men to even greater holiness of life.<sup>1</sup> Whatever the saints do, they do by the power of the Spirit (Yalk Gen. 49). The perfectibility of man towards the possession of the Spirit as an ideal state is well brought out in the celebrated dictum of R. Phinehas b. Jair (2nd cent. A.D.):

Torah leads to carefulness, carefulness to diligence, diligence to cleanliness (ritual purity), cleanliness to self-control, self-control to purity, purity to piety, piety to humility, humility to fear of sin, fear of sin to holiness, holiness to the Holy Spirit, and Holy Spirit to the resurrection of the dead. (Mish. Sotah 9.15, b. 'Abodah Zarah, 20b).

The possession of the Holy Spirit is the culmination of what the religious life should mean in the case of each individual living it.

Not only is holiness of soul a condition for the gift of the Spirit, so also is wholeness of the body. "The

I In connection with the idea of the Spirit as the power for righteous living, it is of interest to note that Jer. Targ. on Gen. 6:3 ("My Spirit shall not always strive with man") interprets the verse theologically, "Have I not set my H.S. in them in order that they may perform good works, but they have done evil. Therefore did I give them a respite of 120 years in order that they should repent: but they would not". Tar. Onk. interprets in terms of simple vitality: "This wicked generation shall not stand before me for ever, seeing they are flesh and their works corrupt".



Holy Spirit rests upon a joyful heart" (Jer. Sukkah 5.1. 55a 63) because happiness is healthy. Sorrow is a bodily imperfection and consequently Jacob, while sorrowing for Joseph, was denied the Holy Spirit (Gen. R.91.6): when he received the tidings of his son's safety the Holy Spirit returned to him (Ab. R. Nathan, 30).<sup>1</sup> Every physical imperfection or derangement of the organism of the body acted as a barrier to the accession of the Spirit.

The Rabbinic interest in a pure environment as a condition of the Spirit's presence led them to deny that it could be effectual in unclean material surroundings. When a devout man sins the Holy Spirit departs (Gen. R.60.3 on 32:14) but the same happens when he approaches a place which is under the power of sin. Yalk. Esther 5:2 says of Esther, "When she approached the abode of idolatry (i.e. the palace of Ahasuerus) the Holy Spirit departed from her and she exclaimed 'My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me'". As a development of this idea, the diminution of prophecy or the cessation of the Spirit was traced to the sinfulness of Israel. Sif. Deut. 173 on 18:12 records that R. Eliezer (80-120 A.D.) asks "Why is the H.S. so little in evidence in Israel?" and answers, "But your sins have separated between you and your God" (Is. 59:2). A sinful nation is no longer a suitable environment for the Holy Spirit. Even outstanding

<sup>1</sup> The OT refers at this point to the 17 of Jacob reviving. Gen. 45:26-7.



Rabbis who were personally worthy of the Holy Spirit were debarred from its enjoyment because of the sinful age. Thus we find a Haggadah, "When the sages entered the house of Guryo at Jericho, they heard the Bath Qol (the Heavenly Voice) announce 'One man is present here who is worthy of the ruah ha-kodesh, but his generation is not worthy of it" (Tos.Sotah 13.3). In short, a favourable religious milieu must exist in addition to saintly men before the Holy Spirit will appear. The attitude enables us to understand the passages in which the geographical location of the Spirit's activities is discussed. According to some Rabbis, Palestine alone was sanctified and the only place, outside the Holy Land, on which the Spirit could be experienced was on the seas which were considered pure. Other teachers suggested that, while God reveals himself everywhere, it was only in Palestine that the Spirit remained constantly: and even within Palestine, it was Jerusalem, the Holy City, which was regarded as the special seat of the Spirit's working. "In order to understand the issue involved in this difference of opinion", says Parzen, "we must bear in mind that Palestine is the Holy Land. Therefore it is the proper place for Revelation. Foreign lands are, from the Rabbinic viewpoint, 'impure', consequently, not suitable for Divine Revelation."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Parzen, op.cit., p.53. See also on this matter J.Abelson op.cit., pp. 275-77.



From discussion of the persons and places in which the Spirit is operative, we turn to the times or epochs of its functioning.<sup>1</sup> In Jewish thought, as represented by the Intertestamental literature, the great figures of the OT period were regarded as inspired by the Holy Spirit: both prophets and patriarchs, and even women like Rebekah (Jub. 25:14) shared in the gift. With their larger view of the nature of prophecy, the Rabbis could claim that the Spirit rested on all the devout and righteous of earlier generations. Moses, David, Solomon, priests, patriarchs and their wives were all equipped and inspired by the power of the Spirit. The past, the remote past, was indeed the great era of the Spirit. What of the present? In the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha it is assumed that, although the great period of prophetic activity has passed, the Spirit may still be granted to men (Wisd. 7:7; 9:17, Sir. 39:6). The Rabbis, on the other hand, clearly state that, after the last prophets, the Spirit departed from Israel.

When the last prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi died, the Holy Spirit ceased out of Israel: but nevertheless it was granted them to hear (the communications from God) by means of a Bath-Qol. b.Yoma 9b, b.Sotah 48, b.Sanh.11a, Mis.Sotah 9.12 Tos.Sotah 13.2.

Some Rabbis even denied that the Spirit had ever been present in the Second Temple (b.Yoma 21b, Num.R.15.10). Despite this

<sup>1</sup> For this and other aspects of the Jewish doctrine see W. Foerster, "Die Heilige Geist im Spätjudentum" NTS, VIII, (1961-62) pp. 117ff.



testimony to the cessation of the action of the Spirit, some scholars (e.g. I. Abrahams<sup>1</sup> and A. Mamorstein<sup>2</sup>) have suggested that it was still often experienced in life. It is not our purpose to review these arguments here; instead, the reader is referred to the careful statement and consideration of them by W.D. Davies in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, (2nd ed.) pp. 209-215. His conclusion seems essentially correct, especially in drawing the distinction between the general drift of Rabbinic statement and theory and the experience of devout individuals.<sup>3</sup>

The evidence, both direct and indirect, of belief in the frequent activity of the Holy Spirit in Rabbinic Judaism is unconvincing. The weight of the evidence suggests that the activity was regarded as a past phenomenon in Israel's history, a phenomenon which had indeed given to Israel its Torah, its prophets and the whole of its Scriptures, but which had ceased when the prophetic office ended. This, however, does not mean that we are to regard Rabbinic Judaism as an arid desert scorched to barrenness by its belief in a transcendent God, who no longer revealed himself to his people. On the contrary, the phenomena ... are eloquent of the awareness of the near presence of God, and we need not deny that there may have been individuals who were conscious of the Holy Spirit as active in their lives. (p.215)

1 Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, (Cambridge 1917-24) Second Series, p.120ff.

2 Studies in Jewish Theology, (Oxford U.P. 1950) "The Holy Spirit in Rabbinic Legend", pp. 122-44.

3 It may be to suggest such a distinction that Abelson (op. cit., p.260) differentiates between three senses in which the H.S. is employed in Rabbinic writings, viz. the Spirit as inspirer of classical prophecy and of the OT books, as the giver of a secondary prophetic endowment to various lesser OT characters and others, and, thirdly as an



If Judaism tended to relegate the activity of the Spirit to the past, it nevertheless sustained a strong hope for the outpouring of the Spirit in the future. The Messiah was expected to possess the Spirit of God.<sup>1</sup> Rooted in such passages as Is. 11:2, this conception was firmly held throughout Jewish history and finds expression in Ps. Sol. 17:37, 18:7; T. Levi 18:7; T. Jud. 24:2. The Targum to Is. 11:2 reiterates the theme and Targ. Is. 42:1ff interprets the Servant as the Messiah and makes God say concerning him, "I will make my Spirit rest upon him". The righteous also will receive the Spirit in the Last Age as the agent of moral regeneration. In the Intertestamental books the connection between final renewal and the gift of the Spirit is not often expressed,<sup>2</sup> but it is clear in the Rabbinic writings. The two passages, Ezek. 36:26-7 ("a new heart will I give unto you and a new spirit") and 37:14 ("I will put my spirit in you and ye shall live") were the foundation texts for the expectation of national revival through the Spirit. In the Age to come the evil impulse would be taken out of Israel's heart and the Spirit would rest upon them (Pesik. 165a). By such a declaration, the notion of the Spirit as a power for moral renewal is strengthened: but the enrichment to the life of any man of achievement in morality and devotion: this last is not a thing of the past.

1 See Foerster, op.cit., p. 119.

2 Jub. 1:23, 4 Esd. 6:26 state that renewal will be given by God. Cf. T. Jud. 24:3 and T. Levi 18:11.



prophetic-inspirational aspect of the Spirit remains important, and for this Joel 2:28ff is the decisive passage. Thus we find in Num. R.15.25

The Holy One, blessed be He, said: In this world individuals were given prophetic power, but in the world to come, all Israel will be made prophets, as it is said (Joel 2:28) I will pour out my spirit on all flesh". (R. Tanhuma).

Before we leave the discussion of the Rabbinic material, we may mention two points. (i) It is a striking fact in the Rabbinic writings that the Spirit is often conceived in material terms. Abelson has drawn together the evidence for this, and instances passages in which it is viewed under the form of light, fire, sound or some other material object, e.g. water or a dove.<sup>1</sup> Conceptions such as these, Abelson suggests, are understandable as the attempts to give expression to mystical, visionary experiences, and should therefore be treated as metaphorical descriptions: the Rabbis did not think of the Spirit as a material object in actuality.<sup>2</sup> (ii) In Rabbinic literature, the Spirit is frequently spoken of in personal categories. The Spirit speaks, weeps, laments and addresses God. Does this mean that in Judaism the Spirit is regarded as a hypostasis, or as a personal angelic being? That would be

<sup>1</sup> Targ. Cant. 2:12 "the voice of the turtle-dove" is paraphrased as "the voice of the Holy Spirit concerning redemption".

<sup>2</sup> Abelson, op.cit., pp. 212ff.



to bring in categories strange to Jewish thought.<sup>1</sup> Rather, in the words of E. Schweizer:

What is intended by using personal categories to describe the activity of the Holy Spirit is not to represent it as a particular heavenly being, but rather as an objective divine reality which encounters a man and lays claim to him . . . a reality which to some extent represents the presence of God and yet is not identical with him.<sup>2</sup>

In similar vein, Abelson denies that the personification of the Spirit suggests any metaphysical divisions in the Godhead: as well as being a circumlocution for the Divine Name, it is primarily a means of expressing the action of God in the life of man.

The Holy Spirit is God's Holy Spirit. It is not itself God; it is a property of God, it is an emanation of God, a visible, or rather perceptible trace of His workings in the world and in the heart of man. It is the Rabbinic portrayal of God in action, it is the emphatic declaration of the nearness of God, His direct concern in the affairs of men, the ever possible accessibility of man to his grace.<sup>3</sup>

Note on the Bath-Qol. Bath-Qol (lit. "daughter of the voice") was, in a sense, an agent of revelation. It often recited Scripture for the guidance of men and gave advice on matters of Halakah (A. Mamorstein, Studies in Jewish Theology, p. 138ff) Its authority was not equivalent to that of the Holy Spirit, because, on occasion, its guidance could be set aside, b.Bab.Metz.59b.

<sup>1</sup> "Hypostasisation" might be applied to the Philonic idea of the Spirit. Cf. P. Volz, Der Geist Gottes, (Tübingen, 1910) pp. 159-65.

<sup>2</sup> Schweizer, The Spirit of God, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Abelson, op.cit., p. 205-206.



## VII. The Dead Sea Scrolls

In the Scrolls discovered at Qumran the word רוח (and its plural) occurs frequently and in a variety of senses.<sup>1</sup> Once it refers to the breath of animals: the horses to be used in the great battle are to be "light of foot and long of breath (רוכי רוח<sup>2</sup>)", 1QM. 6:12. On a few occasions both singular and plural forms connote "wind(s)": CD 8:13, 19.25 (cf. Mic. 2:11), 1QH 1:10 (רוחות צוד means "strong winds" or "mighty spirits"), 1QH 7:23 (the enemies of the Psalmist are as "chaff before the wind"), and possibly 1QH 6.23 and 7.5, although there the word may be used metaphorically. 1QM 10.12 calls the heavens "the support or elevation of

רוחות" i.e. "winds", or possibly "spirits". We may add here that רוח (in the pl.) is used at 1QM 9.13, as occasionally in Ezekiel, to mean "compass points" or "directions":

לכל שלושת רוחות הפנים lit. "in the three directions of the face", that is, to the front, to both sides, but not behind. At 1QH 7.29 רוח appears to mean "emptiness, vacuity, vanity vapour", a sense associated with "wind" and "air" and found in the book of Ecclesiastes.

The use of רוח in the psychological sense to denote disposition, mood or attitude is very common and a few examples must suffice. An upright and humble spirit

<sup>1</sup> See A.A. Anderson, "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM", JSS, VII (1962) pp. 293-303.

<sup>2</sup> Probably not in the OT figurative sense of "patient".



( חן וצניות ) is required if a man's sin is to be atoned, 1QS 3.8. The three priests in the Council of the Community are to be men "who maintain faithfulness on earth with unshakeable purpose and with a contrite spirit ( חן

חן וצניות), 1QS 8.3. The ability to "respond with a contrite spirit ( חן וצניות)" to those in authority comes from God, 1QS 11.2. Those who are contrite in spirit ( חן וצניות), 1QS 11.10, and those who are humble in spirit ( חן וצניות<sup>1</sup>), 1QS 14.7 will be strengthened to fight and conquer in the great battle. All those who volunteer for the great battle (1QM 7.5) must be חן וצניות lit. perfect or blameless

<sup>1</sup> The interpretation of חן וצניות is a matter of some importance. E. Best (NTS, VII, 1960-61, pp. 253-58) interprets it as "the poor or impaired in courage". Following Gaster, he assumes that חן וצניות is parallel to the possession of "the melting heart, slack hands, tottering knees, the bowed shoulder", a series in which each has the preposition ל attached. In fact, חן וצניות seems to be the first of a new series of which each commences with the prep. ל : חן וצניות, and, after the long lacuna, ברתמי חן וצניות. In this new series, the contrast is not between force and weakness, courage and timidity, but between moral qualities and impious cruelty. J. Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre, (Paris, 1958) p. 204 renders the words, "par les humbles d'esprit [sera humilié tout le ...] du coeur de dureté, par les consommés (en) conduite seront consommées toutes les nations d'impiété". B. Jongeling, Le Rouleau de la Guerre, (Assen, 1962) p. 321 renders it, "Et par les pauvres en esprit (l'ennemi) au coeur endurci [est humilié] et par ceux qui sont parfaits de conduite prendront fin toutes les nations impies". His comments (pp. 312-13) "Les pauvres en esprit sont, en effet, pauvres quant aux biens matériels, mais la cause de leur pauvreté est qu'ils marchent dans la crainte de Yahweh, et c'est pourquoi ils sont opprimés dans ce monde". The likeness of the phrase (and also 11.10) to Is. 66:2 is significant. The relevance of this discussion will be evident when we treat the first Beatitude. Cf. also S. Légasse, "Les Pauvres en Esprit et les 'Volontaires' de Qumran", NTS, VIII, (1961-62) pp. 336-345.



in spirit and body (flesh).<sup>1</sup> The  $\pi\pi$  is the seat of fear, 1QS 7.18: a proud, spiteful attitude may be called a "wicked spirit", 1QS 5.26: behaviour which contravenes the rules of the Community is "a spirit of rebellion", 1QS 8.12: a "spirit of wickedness" ( $\pi\pi$   $\pi\pi$ ) causes envy, 1QS 10.18. On a few occasions, the  $\pi\pi$  of a man connotes his willingness or ability to endure affliction: it is almost equal to "courage": 1QH 1.32 "Thou hast established the spirit of man against affliction"; 4.36 "my spirit holdeth fast to the place of standing against affliction"; 5.36 "suffering and shame enter my bones to make the spirit to fail".

Within the Manual of Discipline, the term  $\pi\pi$  several times bears a wider connotation. On entering the Covenant, a man's spirit was examined, and this is further described as testing his understanding and works in the law (5.21): "they shall examine their spirits and deeds year by year to promote each according to his understanding and the perfection of his ways, or retard them", (5.24). A neophyte did not share the Terumah of the Great Ones (Rabim) until he was further examined concerning his spirit and deeds (6.17). Among the duties of the enlightened Instructor ( $\pi\pi$ ) of the sect was the task of "weighing or discerning

<sup>1</sup> It is noticeable that, though 1QH emphasises the sinfulness of the flesh, there is no contrast between "flesh" and "spirit", the former being evil and the latter good. The phrase expresses the totality of a man. It is possible that the phrase here means something like "sound in wind and limb", stressing the adult vitality required.



the Sons of Zadok according to their spirits (  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu$  )", which means "to judge each man according to his spirit and to let each man approach according to the cleanness of his hands (i.e. his deeds) and accept him according to his understanding (  $\nu\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta$  )" 9. 14-16. In these instances "spirit (  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  ) appears to denote "a man's general disposition", his underlying attitude and devotion to the ways of the Sect, which is revealed in his behaviour. While the emphasis here on the religious aspect of man's life may permit us to interpret  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  as "spirituality", we cannot agree with D. Flusser in associating it with the degree to which a member of the Sect possessed the gifts of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> It seems that we have here an extension of the OT use of  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  to describe the controlling impulse or attitude.

The use of  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  /  $\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  to denote "a spirit" or supernatural power was found in some of the later Jewish writings of the Intertestamental literature. That use is evidenced frequently in the Qumran material. All the spirits are either good or bad according to their function or nature, but all are inferior to God, who created them

<sup>1</sup> Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Scripta Hierosolymitana, vol. 4, Jerusalem, 1958) pp. 246-8. Schweizer, op.cit., p.17 says "the word is on the way to meaning the existence of a man specifically as he lives before God, i.e. the self which is set over his soul and body". See also W.D. Davies, "Paul and the DSS: Flesh and Spirit" in The Scrolls and the New Testament, p.177 and E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und Eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des NT" in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, (Cambridge, 1956) pp. 482-508, especially pp. 492-3.



and who is the Lord of every spirit (1QM 10.8). As in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, so in 1QM, the chief of the wicked spirits is Belial. The spirits of his party

רוחי גורלו (1QM 13.2,4,11) are "spirits of perdition"

רוחי (ח) בלו (14.10) and a person may be under their domination (CD 12.2). But God has his spirits also." The mighty one in battle (גבור המלחמה cf. Ps. 24:8) is in our community, the army of his spirits (צבא רוחין) is with our soldiers" 1QM 12.9. These are the "spirits of truth" (רוחי אמת) under the leadership of the Prince of Light, 1QM 13.10.

There is a special section of 1QS (3.13 - 4.26) devoted to the origin and function of the spirits. The substance of the passage is as follows. The God of all knowledge, the source of all that is or will be, "created man to rule the world, and assigned him two spirits in which to walk" till the time of the final visitation. These are the spirits of truth and of wickedness. The former originated in the abode of light and is identical with the Prince or Spirit of Light and the Angel of truth: the spirit of perversion (רוח צול) had its source in darkness and is equivalent to the Angel of darkness. God created both spirits and on them founded all conduct. The ways or counsels of the spirit of truth include humility, slowness to anger, compassion, goodness, understanding, wisdom, knowledge, zeal for righteousness, integrity, mercy, purity



and prudence:<sup>1</sup> the ways of the spirit of error include greed, slackness, wrong-doing, pride, deceit and cruelty.

Under these two spirits are the generations of all the sons of men, and all their hosts..... have an inheritance in their divisions: and in their ways do they walk, and in either of them (lies) all their action and conduct, according to the inheritance of each, whether great or little (in the two spirits) in equal parts until the last period. 3.15-16.

2

At the season of God's visitation (pequddah), wickedness will be destroyed: the "truth of the world" will emerge victorious (probably a synonym for the "spirit of truth").

Then God will cleanse by his truth all the deeds of a man (men), and will refine Him some of the children of men in order to abolish every wicked spirit out of the midst of their flesh: and to cleanse them by a holy spirit from all evil deeds; and He will sprinkle upon him a spirit of truth like purifying water to cleanse him from all lying abominations and from defilement by the spirit of impurity. Thus He will give the upright insight into the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven. 3:20-21.

The section ends with a restatement of the present position: "Until now the spirits of truth and wickedness strive within the heart of man: men walk in wisdom and in folly".

Because of the sharp opposition between the two spirits described in this section, many scholars have interpreted it in terms of the cosmic dualism and determinism of Zoroastrianism or of a pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism. This

<sup>1</sup> Both Flusser, op.cit., p.262 n.157 and M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p.132, n.1 have drawn attention to the similarities between the "ways" of the good spirit and "the fruits of the spirit" in Gal.5:18ff.

2 Translation taken from Black, op.cit., p.133.



explanation seems to over-emphasise the uniqueness of the unit in the Manual and to forget that (by virtue of its preservation and incorporation in the document) it was accepted Qumran teaching, and therefore is best interpreted in terms of the general drift of Qumran thought, which is rooted in the OT. Neither the ultimate origins of the "two-spirits" theme nor parallels to it need determine the meaning of the doctrine for the Sect.<sup>1</sup> While the "two spirits" may have cosmic functions, the emphasis in the passage under discussion is not on their transcendent character

I For a careful treatment (with bibliographical details) of the various interpretations of IQS 3.13ff, see P. Wernberg-Møller, "The Two Spirits in IQS 3.13-4.26", Revue de Qumran, III, (1961) pp.413-41. The following statement is on p.418: "... there is a difference between saying that the notion of the two 'spirits' (as we find it in the Testaments, IQS, the NT etc) is ultimately Persian, and maintaining that the idea -in IQS- is identical with what we have in the Gathas. The difference between the two views is that the former allows for the possibility that the idea, when it was adopted in Jewish and Christian circles, was transformed and reinterpreted and thus fitted into an entirely different context, whereas according to the latter, the idea was adopted - by the Qumran community - in basically the same form in which it was taken over from the Gathas, except that the Jewish monotheistic faith was preserved by regarding the two (cosmic) "spirits" as created by, and thus subservient to, God (cf. IQS 3.25). The result of the application of the latter point of view has been the introduction into Qumran studies of what seems to me to be a false note, due to the emphasis placed upon the supposedly direct Zoroastrian influence. It has thus been maintained that the Qumran community held strictly "dualistic" deterministic views. . . . If, however, one examines the text (i.e. the two spirits section) in its immediate context, and compares the use of certain key words as used in our text, with their application elsewhere in the Judaean manuscripts, it will be seen that IQS 3-4 is capable of a different interpretation".



but on their persistent involvement with the life and behaviour of men.<sup>1</sup> Consequently their function must have a psychological aspect. This is confirmed by the statement that the spirits struggle in the hearts of men until now, 4.23. This aspect of the "two-spirits" doctrine suggests that its background and inspiration may be Jewish and may lie in the idea of the two opposed spirits from the Lord expressed in 1 Sam. 16:14, Eccles. 15:13-14 and in the Test. Jud.20.1ff "Know therefore, my children, that two spirits wait upon man, the spirit of truth and the spirit of error (τὸ τῆς πλάνης [πνεύμα])"<sup>2</sup> where the function of the spirit

1 Cf. E. Schweizer, op.cit., pp.488-93. H.G. May, "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran doctrine of the Two Spirits and in the OT Imagery", JBL, LXXXII, (1963) pp. 1-14 holds together the cosmological settings and expression of the doctrine and its present psychological reality.

2 The question of the dating of the Testaments is disputed. The earlier opinions of M. de Yonge that the document was written by a Christian author using Jewish material (The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Assen, 1953) have been modified, to some extent, by the study of the DSS (see "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", NT, IV, (1960) pp. 182-236) but he still posits extensive Christian influence. A.S. van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, (Assen, 1957) discusses parallels between the Testaments and the Scrolls and suggests that the former was originally a Jewish document, but that the Grundschrift is impossible to reconstruct because the book has been rewritten and abbreviated and subjected to some interpolation. M. Philonenko, Les Interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qumran, (Paris, 1960) suggests a very close link between the two writings and reduces Christian influence on the XII to an almost negligible minimum: the passages which have been called Christian are the work of an Essene interpolator: the similarity between the XII and the Qumran literature is such as to suggest a common origin. The matter will continue



of truth is "to witness to all things and to condemn all things."<sup>1</sup> τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης would correspond to מן מן מן, and, although this exact phrase has not been found in the Qumran texts, we read (1QS 3.21) that the spirit of wickedness leads astray all the sons of righteousness, and that these are the people whose spirits have gone astray, הנה ב'ן מן מן (11.1). Now if the Qumran doctrine of the "two-spirits" can be paralleled in the teaching of the Jewish apocalyptic books, then it is also akin to the Rabbinic doctrine of the good and evil inclinations:<sup>2</sup> the "spirits" that wait upon man are powerful influences, with perhaps even cosmic dimensions, but they are inwardly experienced and they affect conduct. The "two spirits" passage in the Manual is not concerned with a metaphysical theory of dualism, but with psychological insights and the realities of life. The "spirits" are the forces which drive a man to act in a certain way, the influences which condition or bring about behaviour: they to be debated. Although it seems certain that a Jewish Vorlage underlies the present form of the Testaments (as Qumran suggests), the difficulty in deciding the extent and form of this is so great that we must be very cautious in our use of the Testaments in interpreting the NT. In the matter of the "two spirits", the similarity of the Qumran view with that expressed in the Test. Jud. suggests that the doctrines may have had a common origin in Jewish thought.

1 Cf. Jn. 14:17, 15:26, 16:8, 13.

2 Cf. A.A. Anderson, op.cit., p.299, "We are not told of the way in which these influences of the spirits etc. are exercised upon man, but it is possible that the author of 1QS 3-4 may have thought of something approximating to the Rabbinic



create, and to some extent become equivalent to, attitudes and dominant dispositions. If these forces are born of error and wickedness, the resulting conduct is evil and perverse: if they have their source in light and truth, conduct is righteous and good.

A few further points may be made concerning the passage. First, the rather remarkable fact that in the literature of a Sect which was conscious of the nearness of the End, this is the only place where a strictly eschatological significance is ascribed to the Spirit (4.20).<sup>1</sup> Secondly, the function of the Spirit in the End-time is both purificatory and illuminative: the spirit of truth is sprinkled upon the faithful to give knowledge and to cleanse. Thirdly, the spirit of truth and "holy spirit" appear to be identical. If our understanding of the "two spirits" is correct, this must mean that God's holiness or truth, when known and acknowledged, is itself a powerful impetus towards the fulfilment of righteousness in conduct: as that "spirit" operates on man, it exerts a cleansing influence and leads to knowledge and righteousness. This is closely related to what we found it possible to say in explanation of "the spirit of holiness" in Ps.51.

doctrine of the good and evil inclinations". W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.173 considers that the spirits are "two constant currents of good and evil forces in conflict". The emphasis in the DSS seems to be on describing how these currents are experienced by man.

1 On the Spirit and Eschatology in Qumran see Foerster, op. cit. pp. 122ff.



It would be difficult to classify the many uses of  $\text{רוח}$  in the Thanksgiving Hymns, and the very fact of such variety may lend weight to the suggestion made by Davies that the Psalms reflect a later stage in the community's history than that of the other writings, when greater Hellenistic influence had taken place.<sup>1</sup> We mention first examples of  $\text{רוח}$  used to denote man as a whole. The author of 1QH 1.22 refers to himself as "a structure of sin... a spirit of error ( $\text{רוח הַתּוֹעֵב}$ ) perverted without insight", and in 3.21 the writer alludes to himself, or to the community in general, as "a perverted spirit ( $\text{רוח נַעוּה}$ ) who is cleansed from transgression and made fit to share in the fellowship with eternal spirits". The phrase  $\text{רוח נַעוּה}$  appears to be parallel to  $\text{שׂא$  in 3.22 and therefore both phrases probably refer to a man in the entirety of his being. At 1QH 13.13 and 17.25 we find the expression  $\text{רוח בֶּשָׂר}$ , a spirit of flesh. It would seem that this phrase is parallel to "one born of woman" in 13.14 and therefore "spirit of flesh" means "a human being", "a man". The expression does not imply anything derogatory of "spirit". There is no rigid contrast between "flesh" and "spirit", the one being evil and the other good: it is the whole man which is sinful, the whole personality which is perverted. The same doctrine of "two spirits" seems to underlie 1QH, although it may not

<sup>1</sup> Op.cit., p.165.



be so explicitly expressed as in IQS 3-4. We find reference to the "spirits of badness, רוחי אפצח" (IQH 3.18), the "spirits of wickedness (רוחות רשעה)" and of "perversion" in Frag. 5. "A perverted spirit" (רוח נלונה) rules in man, according to 13.15, but the fragmentary state of the passage does not permit us to be explicit: it seems to refer to a man's corrupted spirit or disposition (cf. 1.22). On the other hand, there are "holy spirits" or "spirits of holiness" and "spirits of knowledge" (רוחות דעת) who appear to belong to the same class as the "sons of heaven" and "the host of holy ones" (3.22). The use of "holy spirit" or "spirit of holiness" (רוח קודש) is important in the Hymns. It is the agent of cleansing (16.11-12); it brings knowledge (12, 11, 12; 13.19; 14.25) and gladness (9.32). By this spirit a man is strengthened in the way of righteousness (7.6-7 and cf. 4.31-32). What we said concerning the "holy spirit" in IQS is true here:<sup>1</sup> the influence on a man of the acknowledged holiness and will of God has a cleansing and stabilising power.

In the Damascus Document the phrase "holy spirit" occurs three times. Twice (5.11; 7.4) the reference is to the "holy spirit" within people which may be polluted or defiled by denying the truth of the principles of the com-

<sup>1</sup> W. Foerster, *op.cit.*, p.129ff has compared what was said about the "spirit of truth" in IQS and what is said by the writers of the hymns "through the holy spirit", and he posits the essential similarity of the two expressions.



munity of God. The disposition towards holiness and righteousness may be overcome by disobedience.<sup>1</sup> At CD 2.12 we read "God made known his holy spirit unto them (the Remnant) through his anointed one", i.e. either prophet(s) or priest(s).<sup>2</sup> In other words, God revealed, through the custodian of his truth, his power and presence as a holy God who requires his people to be holy (cf. Is. 63:10-11).

The Manual of Discipline has three references to "holy spirit". It is through the "spirit of God's true counsel (ברוח עצת אמת אל) concerning the ways of man that all his iniquities will be atoned, so that he may look upon the life-giving light; united through the holy spirit (ברוח קדושה) to his truth, man shall be cleansed of all his iniquities; because of an upright and humble spirit his

1 The reference may be to the belief that a "spirit of holiness" was given to man at creation. The late Heb. additions to Test.Naphth. declare "Blessed is he who does not defile the holy spirit of God put upon him and breathed into him; and blessed is he that returns it to his creator pure as on the day he inherited it". In the Shepherd of Hermas, this spirit becomes God's παρακαταθήκη which may be given back to him, either "deceitful and useless" or "unspotted".

2 For the problems and various interpretations of this passage, see Davies, *op.cit.*, p.175 and p.280 n.60. It is doubtful that "anointed one" should be understood of the Messiah(s). The idea that the Messiah imparts Holy Spirit is possibly suggested by the Messianic reading of Is.52:14f in the Qumran Isaiah scroll, but not by CD 2.12 (see W.H. Brownlee, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, pp. 43-44). Test.Jud.24.2-3 tells us that the Messiah pours down the spirit of grace. De Yonge (*op.cit.*) and M.A. Chevallier, (*L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaïsme et le NT*, Paris, 1958) think the passage is Christian, with material from the Qumran sect or a related group incorporated. The reconstruction of the pre-Christian text of the passage



sin shall be atoned.." (1QS 3.6ff). Here we are in touch again with the thought of the OT.. The powerful influence on man's life of God's truth and righteousness creates the desire for and will to achieve holiness through obedience and righteous conduct (cf. Ps.51). At 8.16 the revelations through the prophets are made through the holy spirit (קדוש 1717) - as in Judaism the spirit is the source and inspiration of the prophetic proclamation. Finally at 9.3.

When these things shall come to pass in Israel (i.e. the institution of the community), according to these rules, for a foundation of holy spirit (קדוש 1717) for eternal truth to make atonement for the guilt of the offence and for the sin, and for divine favour to the land, without (מן) i.e. rather than, the flesh of burnt-offerings. . . At that time the men of the community shall be set apart, a house of holiness for Aaron.

The interpretation of the passage is difficult. Does it mean that the possession of the holy spirit is preparatory to the End, or that the discipline of the sect is the foundation on which the spirit will be given in the Age to come?<sup>1</sup> Since the section refers to the creation of the covenant-community it seems that the phrase in question means "an institution of spiritual holiness" a community whose life is ordered by the search for righteousness and truth, through acknowledgment would be very difficult, and probably it is wise to lay little emphasis on the passage as declaring the Messiah's role in giving the Spirit. Within Judaism, it is always God, never the Messiah, who bestows the Spirit.

1 See Davies, op.cit., p.176 for the discussion of the views. He concludes his comment by mentioning as "possible" the interpretation here suggested as likely.



ledgment of the holiness of God and obedience to his will. "Holy Spirit" is essentially a description of the character and direction of the sectarians' total life and piety.

### VIII. The New Testament

Part 1. The Synoptic Gospels: Mark, Q, Special M and L.

We begin this survey of the use of πνεῦμα in the Synoptic Gospels with a brief mention of the application of the term to the "spirits" or demons of evil and illness. We find that the word bears this connotation 14 times in Mark, usually with the adjective ἀκάθαρτον.<sup>1</sup> Where the Matthean and Lucan parallels do not use the same expression, the words δαίμων , δαιμόνιον or some part of the verb δαιμονίζω generally appear. Once, at 8:16, Matthew reads τὰ πνεύματα , without any qualifying adjective, where Mark has δαιμόνια (Mk. 1:34). Both Matthew (12:43) and Luke (11:24 use ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα in a passage for which there is no Markan parallel, viz. the sequel to the Beelzebub controversy.<sup>2</sup>

This use of πνεῦμα is already familiar to us from our discussion of the Intertestamental literature, where πνεῦμα is used frequently in the demonologies of I Enoch, Jubilees and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. It may have its

<sup>1</sup> Mk. 1:23, 26, 27; 3:11, 30; 5:2, 8, 13; 6:7; 7:25; 9:25; 9:17, 25 ( π. ἄκαλον , κωφόν ) and 9:20 ( πνεῦμα ).

<sup>2</sup> These passages and Mk. 3:30 will be discussed later when the contexts of the sayings are investigated.



origin in such a passage as 1 Sam.16:14ff and its LXX translation. The later Rabbinical literature, and especially the Babylonian Talmud, reveals a wealth of allusions to "spirits" (רוח, רוחות) and their harmful activities among men: the same is true of the literary and non-literary texts of Hellenism.

The "psychological" use of πνεῦμα is attested three times in Mark. At Mk. 2:8 Jesus knows τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ (dative of sphere) the thoughts of others, where πνεῦμα ("spirit") connotes the seat of knowledge and sensitivity (cf. Ezek. 11:5, 20:32). There is no reference to the Holy Spirit, nor is the knowledge necessarily supernatural in character (cf. 5:30, "Jesus knew ἐν ἑαυτῷ"), although, if the events took place as recorded, the impression given might easily have been of supra-normal insight. The statement that "Jesus groaned in his spirit (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ)" Mk. 8:12, accords with the OT use of פֶּיַךְ (LXX πνεῦμα) to denote the seat of deep emotion. The third instance of πνεῦμα meaning "human spirit" is Mk. 14:38 (with parallel Matt.26:41) where the contrast is drawn between πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ("willing spirit") and σὰρξ δσθενής ("weak flesh"). The contrast πνεῦμα - σὰρξ immediately directs the mind to Paul, but the Apostle's meaning is not that of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange, Saint Marc (6th ed. Paris, 1942, p.390) suggests that there may be some foundation for the Pauline doctrine in this saying of Jesus. This may be true, if we accept the saying as a genuine utterance.



In Mark "flesh" does not mean "life in opposition to God and the Spirit"; it is the frailty of the body, which may hinder the highest desires of the will from being fulfilled. The disciples wanted to watch with the Master, but bodily weakness checked them. E. Schweizer presents a quite different interpretation.<sup>1</sup> He claims that πνεῦμα is not "some better part of man's nature", but is "the Spirit of God which is temporarily imparted to a man and fights against human weakness". In support of this exegesis, Schweizer states that the phrase "willing spirit" is derived from the Hebrew text of Ps. 51:14 (Eng. vers. 12)<sup>2</sup> where it is identical with the "Spirit of God". To this argument we may reply that, while it is possible that the phrase in the Psalm הַלֵּלִי ה' (LXX ἡγεμόνικον) could be understood in the sense of πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, it is not identical with "holy spirit": the nature and sequence of the parallelism of vs. 12-14 (MT) suggests that it is closer in meaning to the experience of joy in God's salvation, and connotes a "tractable spirit", i.e. a spirit responsive to God and capable of meeting the demands of the new situation. The logic of the narrative in Mark requires that the distinction between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ be understood, not in terms of the difference between God

<sup>1</sup> The Spirit of God, (Bible Key Words, London, 1960) pp.24-25.

<sup>2</sup> R.G. Bratcher, Interpretation, XVI (1962) pp.490ff. criticises Schweizer's view as if it were based on v.12 of the MT, instead of 14 (MT), i.e. 12 in Eng. versions. See also Schweizer's reply in vol. XVII no. 1 (Jan. 1963) of the same journal.



and man, but, as we have suggested, between the will of man and his physical weakness.<sup>1</sup> At Matt. 27:50 πνεῦμα is used of the "life-breath": ὁ δε Ἰησοῦς ... ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, where Mark and Luke use the verb ἐξέπνευσεν, "expired".

All the Evangelists declare that at the Baptism of Jesus the Spirit descended upon him, like a dove, the dove being a symbol in late Judaism for the Holy Spirit,<sup>2</sup> as well as for the community of Israel. The nature of the Baptism narrative marks off the event as something different from the call of a prophet and his endowment with the Spirit. The significance of the Baptism is its Messianic character. The utterance of the voice (the Bath-qol, i.e. the substitute, in Jewish thinking, for the lost guidance of the Spirit) echoes Ps. 2:7 and Is. 42:1 and indicates that Jesus is both "Son of God" and "Elect Servant". Now the declaration that Jesus is the Servant makes necessary his endowment with the Spirit. Is. 42:1 says "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights: I have put my spirit upon him", and Is. 61:1 "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me". Likewise, since the use of Ps. 2:7 suggests that, at his baptism, "Jesus becomes or is revealed as Son of God, not as the result of a divine begetting, but because he is then

<sup>1</sup> The Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich lexicon classifies this use under "human spirit" and most commentators do likewise.

<sup>2</sup> The Targum to Cant. 2:12 explains "the voice of the turtle-dove" as "the voice of the Holy Spirit concerning redemption".



installed as King Messiah, the true successor of David,"<sup>1</sup> the Spirit becomes an indispensable gift, because, in Jewish thinking, an endowment of Spirit was to be part of the equipment of the Anointed One. 1 Enoch 49:3 (of uncertain date) claims, "In Him (the Elect One) dwells the spirit of wisdom and the spirit which gives insight" and Ps. Sol. 17:37 (1st cent. B.C.) declares "God will make him (the Messiah) mighty by means of holy spirit, and wise by means of understanding with strength and righteousness". Moreover, the Messianic hymn in Test. Levi 18:6ff asserts:

The heavens shall be opened and from the temple of  
glory shall come upon him sanctification,  
With the Father's voice, as from Abraham to Isaac:  
And the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him,  
And the spirit of understanding and sanctification  
shall rest upon him (in the water). 2

The descent of the Spirit at Jesus' baptism is to be understood then as the endowing of the Messiah with strength,

I C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition,  
(London 1947) p.41. (Abbreviation of title HSOT).

2 The words "in the water" are generally considered to be a post-Christian interpolation. As mentioned earlier in this work, there is no unanimity on the dating of the Testaments. De Yonge regards the work as extensively influenced by Christian thinking, but many scholars consider that it was originally a Jewish text which later underwent rewriting. Caution must be exercised in the use of the Testaments and sometimes C.K. Barrett (op.cit.) is too ready to accept its evidence. In the matter before us, however, the Ps. Sol. provide reliable evidence for the endowment of the Messiah with Spirit. If the section quoted from Test. Levi were post-Christian and reflected the Baptism of Jesus, the words "with the Father's voice.." would be difficult to understand. In From Babylon to Bethlehem (ed. L.E. Browne, 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge, 1951, pp. 95-96) M. Black has interpreted this expression from Abraham's only recorded word to Isaac, "God



wisdom and holiness, in short, his endowment with the power of God for the fulfilment of the Messianic ministry. There is nothing new here in the conception of the Spirit: it is rooted firmly in the use of the term with a charismatic sense in the OT and Jewish writings. However, when we remember that Judaism denied the activity of the Spirit in the present and expected it to be renewed only in the Last Age, we see a deep significance in the narrative. There is no new doctrine of the Spirit, but the very fact that the Spirit is regarded as having been given suggests that the event (the Baptism) is being pin-pointed as the beginning of the New Age, the Age of the Messiah. This is indeed as far as Mark takes back the question of Messianic origins. Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, press the matter further back, to the birth of the Messiah as a human being. To those narratives we shall devote attention later.

At this point we may investigate the saying of John the Baptist concerning the baptism with which the "Stronger One" will baptise his people. The logion has been preserved in two forms: the shorter Markan form at 1:8 "He will baptise you [ἐν] πνεύματι ἁγίῳ", and the Q version (Mt. will provide himself a lamb", Gen. 22:8. On this view, the theme of sacrifice is inherent in the Messiah's election and ordination. The words υἱὸς ἀγαπῆτός recall the description of Isaac at Gen.22:2,12 (LXX) τὸν υἱὸν σου τὸν ἀγαπῆτόν. For the view that Test. Levi 18 is dependent on the New Testament, see M.A. Chevallier, L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaïsme et le NT (Paris, 1958) pp. 125-30.



3:11 and Luke 3:16) which reads "He will baptise you ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ", and which continues "whose fan is in his hand, thoroughly to cleanse his threshing-floor and to gather the wheat into his garner: but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire". Many distinguished commentators have decided that, in the Q version, the words ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ are a Christian interpretation and insertion, and that the original form of the saying was "He will baptise you with fire". Not least among the reasons for this view is the unsuitability to the context of a reference to the Spirit: the theme of the prophecy is the purification or judgment of Israel, and the introduction of a reference to the gracious gift of the Spirit (or Holy Spirit) is therefore scarcely consistent. The same assumption may underlie the suggestion that the original form included the word πνεύματι, but with the meaning "wind": the Baptism was to be by "wind and fire".<sup>1</sup> Though this interpretation implies that the meaning of the prophecy was recast under the influence of Pentecost,<sup>2</sup> it has the merit of providing an understanding of πνεῦμα which is in harmony with the verses following: the wind winnows the grain and the fire burns the chaff. We may summarise the position on the Q version in this way: the theme of the prophecy is IA few witnesses to Luke 3:16 omit ἁγίῳ .

2 Cf. E. Best, "Spirit-Baptism" NT, IV, (1960) pp. 236-43.



purification and judgment: the agents or instruments of this cleansing are πνεῦμα (ἀγίον) and πῦρ : the judgement-theme has created difficulty for the interpretation of πνεῦμα as "the Spirit". Most commentators are of the opinion that the Markan version of the saying must have been understood by its readers, and probably by Mark himself, as a reference to the outpouring of the Spirit on the Church (which is its interpretation at Acts 1:5 and 11:16) and that the form was influenced by Christian baptismal-practice after the pattern of Acts 2:38 and 19:1ff, in which "water - baptism" conveyed the gift of the Spirit. Recently J.E. Yates has challenged this view.<sup>1</sup> He claims (i) that Acts 1:5 is an editorial comment which shows that Luke intended the Baptist's words to be understood as fulfilled in the Pentecostal outpouring: (ii) that the Markan and Q versions of the saying preserve an earlier and correct understanding, according to which the promise was fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus, from his Baptism to his death; that is to say, the Baptism with the Spirit is the "visitation" and "overwhelming" of all Israel (not just believers within the New Israel) by the presence and power of God active in the proclamation of the Kingdom by Christ: the Spirit (as in Q) is the agent or instrument of cleansing and judgment; it is not

1 Originally in an article "The Form of Mark 1:8b", NTS, IV, (1957-58) pp. 334-38, and in extended form in The Spirit and the Kingdom, (London, 1963).



an endowment, a gift of something static and impersonal; moreover, the theme of judgement is important throughout Mark, even if the promise of the Spirit is not specifically related to it, as in the Q context: (iii) that if, as is possible, Mark's form has been influenced by the Christian practice of Baptism, the influence was not according to the pattern of Acts 2:38 and 19:1ff, but the earlier pattern in Acts 10-11, in which the Spirit is the means or agent of the divine action.

This interpretation of Mark 1:8 certainly brings the verse into harmony with the Q version by taking the dative case (with or without *ἐν*) as instrumental,<sup>1</sup> and by suggesting that in both places the "holy Spirit" is the agent of purification. There is, however, a difficulty in the explanation of "baptise" as metaphorical and as meaning "overwhelm". This sense of "baptise" is found in Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50 and appears in Judaism, but never (so far as we can find) of a visitation of the Spirit of God to men in judgment and cleansing. Furthermore, Yates appears to find it impossible to hold together the conceptions of the Spirit as agent or means of spiritual purification and as gifted endowment. Now we agree that we have been all too ready to imagine that Mark himself (irrespective of how he was later interpreted) must have been referring to the Pentecost

<sup>1</sup> With Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, (Göttingen, 1937) p. 19.



outpouring. Is there no other idea of spirit-endowment? Let us remember that the saying is a prophecy of the Baptist, whose message was essentially one of eschatological judgment. The hour of God's visitation had struck: cleansing and judgment would be its content: is not the agent of both in some sense also an endowment of the people who experience the action?

At this point we wish to introduce evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls. We do not enter into the question of the relation of John to the Qumran sect,<sup>1</sup> but it is very reasonable to see a language-parallel to the Johannine promise in IQS 4.20-21. The section describes the visitation of God (the pequddah) when a portion of mankind will be refined and purged.

Then God will cleanse by his truth all the deeds of  
a man (or men)<sup>2</sup>  
And will refine him some of the children of men,  
In order to abolish every wicked spirit out of the  
midst of their flesh;  
And to cleanse them by a holy spirit (שׁוֹרֵחַ קוֹדֵשׁ)  
from all evil deeds;  
And He will sprinkle<sup>3</sup> upon him a spirit of truth  
like purifying water....  
Thus he will give the upright insight into the know-  
ledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the  
sons of heaven. .

<sup>1</sup> See J.A.T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community", HTR, L, (1957) pp. 175-91, especially pp. 183ff, where the importance of the passage we refer to is stressed.

<sup>2</sup> The "man" may be a special individual (a prophet-Messiah) or each member of the community. See W.H. Brownlee, BASOR, CXXV (1954) pp. 36-8 and Y. Yadin, JBL, LXXIV (1955) pp. 40ff.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the Spirit was expected to come in connection with the Sect's lustral rites, for the gift of the spirit is associated with a sprinkling of clean water in Ezek. 36:25.



Here in an eschatological context,<sup>1</sup> with reference to "refining" and to "fire", the Spirit is both agent of cleansing and an endowment. What does "holy spirit" or "spirit of truth" mean here? We suggest that it is close to what we discovered to be the meaning of "holy spirit" in Ps. 51. It is that inward sense of God's holiness, that knowledge of his presence (cf. v.22) which both purifies man and directs him in the way of holiness.<sup>2</sup> As pointed out earlier, we have been too ready to think of πνεύματι ἁγίῳ in Mark and Q solely in terms of the Holy Spirit of Pentecost: we would submit that the expression originally referred to a sprinkling by God of his people in the time of His visitation, a giving to them, through the presence and action of the Stronger One (Jesus),<sup>3</sup> of an inward awareness of the power of God to cleanse and renew life.

One of the features common to the Synoptic accounts of the Temptation of Jesus is the declaration that, at that time, Jesus was under the influence of the Spirit. Mark 1:12 has τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει, the verb indicating strong propulsion and recalling the violent seizures of men in the

1 This is, in fact, the only place in the Scrolls, at which the Spirit has ascribed to it a strictly eschatological significance.

2 This interpretation is consonant with the general context of the passage, the section of the Two Spirits. We suggested earlier that the best understanding of these spirits is based on the use of 𐤍𐤏𐤔 to mean "dominating disposition": the "spirits" are influences directing character.

3 The Scrolls have provided no exact parallel for the idea that it is through the "coming one" that God would baptise



Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> This phrase is modified by Matthew: ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος (4:1) and Luke: πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ... ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (4:1). The Matthean account retains the suggestion that the Spirit exercised a controlling influence upon Jesus, but, according to Schweizer, this is changed in the Lucan version.

Luke avoids giving the impression that the Spirit is an agent set over Jesus. He is not satisfied with the OT idea of the power of God falling on a man. Instead, Jesus becomes the agent - "in the Holy Spirit". He is no longer a Man of the Spirit (Pneumatiker), but is now Lord of the Spirit.

However true this last statement may be for the Lucan conception of the relation of the Spirit and Jesus, it is doubtful if it can be drawn out of the verse in question. The inward possession of the Spirit is suggested by the characteristic Lucan addition "full of holy Spirit", but the subjection of the Spirit to Jesus is not evident in the phrase, ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. The verb is passive and the words ἐν τῷ πνεύματι can only be interpreted as either (i) denoting agency, "by the Spirit" or (ii) as descriptive of Jesus, and equivalent to "in the power of the Spirit"; but even this view does not support the idea of Jesus' control over the Spirit.<sup>3</sup> It seems that all three Evangelists His people with Holy Spirit. It is extremely unlikely that CD 2.10 should be made to bear this meaning.

1 Cf. 2 Kings 2:16.

2 Op.cit., p.37.

3 In Interpretation XVII, (1963) p.123 Schweizer comes near to accepting the explanation of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι in terms of status.



regard the Spirit, at this point, as a power leading Jesus to and (as Luke emphasises) equipping him to meet, the Messianic temptations. We are in touch still with essentially OT ideas of the Spirit's action.

The conception of the Spirit as the divine power which makes possible certain actions is again evident at Mark 3:29, the logion on blasphemy which occurs in the context of the Beelzebub controversy. The Markan version of the saying is straightforward: ὅς οὖν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . The following verse and the general context make the interpretation clear. The blasphemy means the attributing of the works of Jesus to the power of evil, the assertion that He cast out demons by being in league with the prince of demons. The "holy spirit" is the divine presence and power which inspires the works of Jesus: to say that Jesus has an unclean spirit (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ) is to attribute the inspiration of his actions to a diabolical power. The form of the saying in Matthew and Luke is less easy to interpret. At Matt. 12:31, ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία corresponds to the Markan logion and causes no difficulty. In the following verses, however, Matthew has a Q form of the saying, which Luke also gives, but in a different context which it does not easily fit, at 12:10. In this version, the contrast is not between blasphemy and all other sins, but between "blasphemy" (Luke) or



"speaking against the Holy Spirit" (Matt.) which is not forgiven, and speaking against the Son of Man which is forgiven. If we adopt the view that a genuine dominical utterance is preserved here, then we may claim that the saying means that, while speaking against the person of the Son of Man (Jesus) is forgiveable, speaking against the power by which He works (i.e. the divine endowment) is not. On this interpretation, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον means, as it does in Mark, the gift of God for the healing works of the Messianic ministry.<sup>1</sup> The difficulty with this view is that it makes a distinction between the person of the Son of Man and his power: to speak against the one surely involves speaking against the other! Consequently many scholars regard the saying as coming out of the Church's consciousness of itself as the spirit-filled community. The Holy Spirit is the constitutive factor in the Church's life, and to speak against it would be tantamount to apostasy, a denial of the very root and spring of the community's existence. Blasphemy of, or speaking against, the Son of Man would then be the attitude of a person outside the Church who fails to recognise who Jesus is: his sin is forgiven, because he might later be brought to repentance and faith. But there is no excuse for the denial of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> One might add that the context in which Luke places the saying suggests that the "spirit" is the inspiration to confess Christ: to deny Christ means deliberately and totally to reject this inspiration.



power by anyone in the post-Pentecost community. In other words, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a sin committed within the Church, blasphemy against the Son of Man is a sin committed outside the Christian fellowship.<sup>1</sup> Thus we either regard the logion as authentic, in which case τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἕγιον is the divine inspiring power by which Jesus acts, or we regard it as a church tradition (perhaps reinterpreting the Markan saying) and understand the Holy Spirit as the endowment of power experienced within the Church.

The Matthean account of the Beelzebub controversy provides the context for another occurrence of the word πνεῦμα. "If I, by the Spirit of God (ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ), cast out devils, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you" 12:28. Luke 11:20 reads "by the finger of God (ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ)" and the arguments in favour of the priority of this form seem better.<sup>2</sup> However, there is no real difference of meaning, since both phrases are ways of expressing the mighty power of God which inspires Jesus in his exorcisms.

<sup>1</sup> The essence of this view is found in the Fathers and has a long history of acceptance: see Barrett, HSQT, pp. 106-7.

<sup>2</sup> Would Luke, with his interest in the Holy Spirit, have changed the reference to δακτύλῳ? The Matt. version may well be an explanation of the sense of the other reading, giving Matthew a convenient introduction to the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Yates (The Spirit and the Kingdom, p.90ff) considers that Luke made the substitution because he did not wish to connect "the Spirit" with action; his predilections associated it with inspiration. Here, as elsewhere in his work, Yates distinguishes too rigidly between the Spirit as agent and as a possessed endowment.



These, like the healing miracles, are Messianic actions and signs of the Kingdom's reality and presence.<sup>1</sup>

We come now to Mark 12:36 and its parallels at Matt. 22:43 and Luke 2:42. According to Mark, Jesus introduces the quotation of Ps. 110:1 (LXX) with the words, "David spake in the Holy Spirit (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ)". Matthew reproduces the thought and recasts the sentence, omitting the word "holy". Luke has "David says in the book of Psalms". No other Biblical quotation in the Gospels is introduced with the words found here in Mark and Matthew. The allusion to "holy Spirit" appears to be concerned less to emphasise the inspired state of David (the assumed author) than to declare that the quotation was in the OT, the inspired book. The common Rabbinic "identification" of the OT scriptures with the prophetic Holy Spirit (the agent of their inspiration) was referred to earlier, but this is the only occasion (with Matt. 22:43) when the idea occurs in the Gospels, and it is introduced because the argument required the citation of an acknowledged authority.<sup>2</sup> We might have expected the Synoptists to speak more often of the Holy Spirit (of prophecy) in reference to the OT, which they frequently quote: presumably, its authority was

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of ἐφ' ὅτι is disputed: the miracles etc. are signs that the Kingdom has arrived or that it is imminent.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that Jesus' words accord with a conventional Jewish usage may be taken as evidence for the historicity of the saying in the Marcan/Matthean form.



sufficiently recognised without adducing any reference to the source of its inspiration.

In the course of his teaching ministry, Jesus promised that divine help would come to His followers when they were put on trial before human authorities. The tradition to this effect is strongly attested and is probably authentic. At Mark 13:11 (in the Apocalyptic discourse) we read, "And when they bring you to trial and deliver you up, do not be anxious beforehand what you are to say, but say whatever is given you in that hour, for it is not you who speak, but τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον". Matt. 10:19 (in the mission charge) says "It is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν) which speaketh in you". The Lucan passages are 21:14-15 (appearing in a context similar to that of the Markan saying) which speaks, not of the Holy Spirit, but "I (Jesus) will give you mouth and wisdom", and 12:12 (referring to arraignment before the authorities) "The Holy Spirit (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) will teach you in that hour what you must say". It may be significant that the occasion of the divine assistance and inspiration is, in all the contexts, a time of persecution, betrayal, accusation. When we attempt to discover which form of the saying is the original, Luke 21:15 appears to invite confidence. It comes from a primitive source and, in view of Luke's special interest in the doctrine of the Spirit, it



is difficult to think that he would have replaced a reference to the Spirit with "I will give you mouth and wisdom". Nevertheless, there is good reason for doubting the originality of this form. As Vincent Taylor says, "It has a distinctly Johannine ring and appears to reflect the doctrine of the Exalted Christ".<sup>1</sup> It represents Jesus as speaking in a manner reminiscent of God speaking to the prophets. The combined testimony of Mark and Q (reflected in Matthew and probably in Luke 12:12) is hard to set aside; and all these versions of the saying speak of the "Holy Spirit" (or the "spirit of your Father"). Luke seems to heighten the direct, almost personal, action of the Spirit (the spirit teaches), whereas Matthew and Mark ascribe to the Spirit the function of inspiration (the Spirit speaks in or for the disciples). It ought to be observed, however, that this is not a universal outpouring of the Spirit, but, as we said before, an endowment of power for a specific kind of situation. For faithful witness to the Gospel - which will involve suffering and affliction - the divine aid will be given.

We have now completed the references to "spirit" in Mark and in the Q tradition. Of those who are theologically significant, only Mark 13:11 and parallels, and possibly Mark 3:29, can be attributed with any degree of certainty to Jesus, and these two references are in harmony

<sup>1</sup> The Gospel according to St. Mark, p.509.



with the OT idea of the spirit as a charismatic endowment of power. In the one case, this power, signifying God's presence, marks the action of Jesus, and in the other, is available for his faithful disciples in times of extreme need. Most of the references in the early tradition are associated with the Messianic interpretation of the ministry of Jesus, within which the "spirit" is regarded (again following the OT and Judaism) as the special equipment in wisdom and strength which enables him to fulfil the tasks of Messiahship.

Special M. Of the passages peculiar to Matthew in which the term πνεῦμα appears, we take first Matt. 5:3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit (οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι) for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven". (Note that Luke 6:20 has οἱ πτωχοί). This cannot mean "poor in the holy Spirit". The reference is to human spirit, and the dative (πνεύματι) is one of reference or respect,<sup>1</sup> cf. 5:8. It seems probable that the Matthean version is drawing out the essential meaning of the Lucan and more original form. The "poor" are not those who merely possess little material wealth, but those who, in addition to their poverty, and even because of it, have a firm trust in the faithfulness of God. They are the עַם הָאֶרֶץ, the "people of the land", the עַמּוּלָא (עַמּוּלָא) of Ps. 37:11ff. Now, the explanatory addition, τῷ πνεύματι, referring to

I A Greek Grammar of the NT, (trans. R.W. Funk) para. 197.



human spirit, reflects a Semitic period of transmission of the text, rather than a Hellenistic, since in common Greek usage, πνεῦμα was not used of "human spirit". Consequently, it seems certain that we should posit for the Matthean saying an original Hebrew (Aramaic) form פִּיךָ יָיִן. This phrase actually appears in LQM 14:7 and in an earlier section of this study we discussed its meaning, and rejected Best's interpretation ("poor or impaired in courage") in favour of "the humble poor who trust in God's help". If this interpretation is correct, then the single discoverable example of פִּיךָ יָיִן (= πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι) confirms our understanding of the Lucan version and at the same time demonstrates the accuracy with which Matthew expanded and explained it. The "poor" and "the poor in spirit" are the oppressed poor who maintain a humble trust in the mercy and power of God; and such indeed are blessed.

As an explanation of the silence required by Jesus from those whom he had healed, Matthew quotes Is. 42:1ff: "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights: I will put my spirit (τὸ πνεῦμά μου) upon him; he shall not strive nor cry..." (Matt. 12:18ff) - this last sentence providing the testimonium for secrecy. It is clear that the endowment of Jesus as the Servant with the Spirit is regarded as the explanation of his power to work miracles of healing. Once again we are in touch with the charismatic



understanding of "spirit" in the OT. The spirit is not only a general endowment of the Messiah: it manifests itself specifically in the ability to work cures.

The apostolic commission at Matt. 28:18ff contains the command to "baptise them (the nations) εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. It is possible, but not likely, that the triple formulation is an ancient insertion.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, in assuming that it belongs to the correct text of the Gospel, we are not assuming the historicity of the saying. Luke, John and Paul, and even Mark 16:15ff, have no knowledge of it: the primitive Church seems to have baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus only (Acts 2:38, 8:16), and, in fact, appears to have engaged in long controversy before undertaking any mission to the Gentiles. The saying reflects the situation of the Church and its thinking at least a generation after the death of Jesus. Triadic formulae appear occasionally in Paul and in other NT writers (2 Cor.1:21, 13:13; 1 Pet.1:2; Jude 20f. and Rev. 1:4-6). These passages are doxological or liturgical formulae, and some scholars would include the Matthean text in the latter category, since it does not advance any particular Trinitarian doctrine..<sup>2</sup> But, in view of the fact that it is a very precise formulation, some writers regard

1 For the arguments see Barrett, HSGT, pp. 102-3.

2 Cf Schweizer, op.cit., p.31.



it as the product of theological fixation, and suggest that it reflects, not simply a liturgical form, but a settled and familiar creedal statement.<sup>1</sup> This view would require us to posit a much later date for the formula. Whatever be the date of its origin, this passage uses πνεῦμα in a sense distinct from any other in Matthew. "Holy Spirit" does not here refer to an endowment with divine power: it is personalised and elevated into relationship with the Father and the Son.

The Matthean account of the birth of Jesus refers twice to his conception by the Holy Spirit: 1:18, of Mary, εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, and 1:20, the words of the angel to Joseph, τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἔστι ἁγίου. Many lines of interpretation have been advanced, many parallels adduced, to elucidate the meaning of conception by the Holy Spirit. These are reviewed and evaluated by C.E. Barrett in his book The Holy Spirit and Gospel Tradition and followed by his own explanation. He draws attention to OT passages in which the Spirit acts creatively in relation to the primal birth of the world and of man (Gen. 1:2, 2:7; Ps. 33:6, 104:30; Jb. 27:3, 32:8, 33:4; Prov. 8:22) and in the redemption or recreation of the people of God (Is. 44:3f and Ezek. 37: 1-14). This creative aspect of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, (trans. J.K.S. Reid, London, 1949) p.38 note 1, for the distinction between liturgical formulae and creeds.



the Spirit's activity is found in some of the Inter-testamental books (Wis. 7:22, 15:11; Jud. 16:14; 2 Bar. 21:4) but it was not retained in Palestinian (Rabbinic) Judaism. It finds expression (in a philosophically reinterpreted fashion) in Philo and in Judaism as it came under the influence of Hellenistic thought (Op. Mund. 29ff.) In Rabbinic Judaism there lingered, however, the notion of the Spirit's activity as the recreating, revivifying power of the Messianic era (Ex. R.48.102d, and 96.60d.).<sup>1</sup> With this background of thought, the Christians appear to have believed that "just as the Spirit of God was active at the foundation of the world, so that Spirit was to be expected also at its renewal".<sup>2</sup> Now the renewal of the world was intimately bound up with Messianism and eschatological hopes, and consequently the entry of the Messiah upon the stage of history was regarded as the work of the Spirit: thus the activity of the Spirit - as divine creating power, creating the life of the Messianic child - was introduced into the birth narratives. Since this aspect of the Spirit's work was more prominent in the thought of Hellenistic rather than of Palestinian Judaism, "it seems probable that the elucidation of the birth of Jesus in terms of the creative work of

<sup>1</sup> These passages are discussed in the relevant section of this work. Not all of them are patent of Barrett's interpretation, but the theme is present, if not prominent, in Judaism. See p.436 above.

<sup>2</sup> Barrett, HSQT, p.23.



the Spirit took place on the basis of Hellenistic rather than Palestinian interpretation of the Old Testament"<sup>1</sup> - and in Hellenistic thought there was already a prepared ground for ideas of miraculous conception which encouraged theories of virgin-birth. In short, the Spirit here is the creating power and activity of God inaugurating the New Creation by the conception of the Messianic redeemer. In accepting this interpretation, we would add one further point. On this view of the Birth narratives, Jesus' birth becomes the type of what Paul calls the New Creation and John the New Birth (cf. Jn. 1:13, 3:5ff).

Special Luke. We turn now to the Special Lucan tradition and we find that, in its Birth narratives, the conception of Jesus is again attributed to the action of the Holy Spirit:

πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ (Mary) καὶ δυνάμεις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς

θεοῦ (1:35). The "Spirit" is equated with the power of God, while the verb ἐπισκιάζειν (cf. the "overshadowing" of the cloud at the Transfiguration) recalls, in thought and sound, the "Shekinah", the name for the presence of God.<sup>2</sup> This power and presence of God in the Spirit is the life-giving agent in the birth of the New Man who inaugurates the New Age. The belief that the New Age has come is strikingly demonstrated by Luke's account of all the circumstances

<sup>1</sup> Barrett, HSBT, p.23.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p.33.



surrounding Jesus' birth. This was a period characterised by a mighty outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy. John is to be filled with "holy spirit" even from his mother's womb (1:15): he is to walk in the spirit (πνεύματι) and power of Elijah (1:17). Elizabeth, his mother, becomes a prophetess, filled with the holy Spirit (1:41) and blesses Mary under the inspiration of the Spirit. Zacharias too is filled with the holy Spirit and prophesies (1:67). The Spirit rests on Simeon (2:25): he receives a divine oracle "in the Spirit" (26) and enters the Temple under the inspiration of the Spirit (27). It will be remembered that in our survey of Jewish thinking about the Spirit (where it was considered predominantly as the Spirit of prophecy) we pointed out that, while the action of the Spirit in the present was not affirmed, there was a lively expectation of its coming in the future Age, the Messianic era. Now we see this hope fulfilled: we find the Spirit in the full vigour of its operation at the beginning of the Gospel story. The new dawn has broken (ἡ ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους): the new age has arrived: the signs of its presence are experienced.

The persistence of the connection between the gift and work of the Spirit and the coming of the Messianic age is evidenced by the Marcionite reading of the Lord's Prayer (Lk. 11:2): ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα σου (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς) καὶ καθαρίσάτω ἡμᾶς. This text may represent a variant used



at Baptism<sup>1</sup> or Luke's own interpretation of the clause "Thy Kingdom come" which he found in his source.<sup>2</sup> It is completely in harmony with Luke's view that the supreme object of prayer is the gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup> At 11:13 in his Gospel we read, "How much more shall the Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) to them that ask him", where Matthew has "good things". At this point, the text of Luke is somewhat uncertain and the Matthean version is probably the original. Luke appears to be reading into the saying his own thought and reading back the possibility of the gift of the Spirit to a time before that in which he generally states that the Spirit will be given, namely after the death and resurrection of Jesus (Lk. 24:49, Acts 2:33).

One of the distinctive features of Luke's work is the importance he gives to the Spirit in relation to the life of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> He alone emphasises the completeness of Jesus' possession by the Spirit (πλήρης πνεύματος) at the Temptation (4:1). Jesus returns to Galilee, according to the

<sup>1</sup> The reading states the meaning inferred from Acts 11, where the Holy Spirit "comes upon" the audience while Peter is still speaking and water-baptism follows.

<sup>2</sup> On the Lucan text of the Lord's Prayer see A.R.C. Leaney, NT, I, (1956) pp. 103-11.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout his writings Luke emphasises the Spirit as gift, something inwardly possessed.

<sup>4</sup> On this theme cf. G.W.H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the writings of St. Luke", Studies in the Gospels, (ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955) pp. 189-200.



Lucan account, "in the power of the Spirit (ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος)" 4:14, i.e. filled and inspired by the Spirit (as a prophet) rather than "one who possesses the power of the Spirit".<sup>1</sup> In the synagogue at Nazareth he proclaims himself to be the Spirit-anointed prophet of Is. 61:1 whose mission is to bring in the age of salvation. This important passage stands like a prologue or frontispiece to Luke's work: it is the charter of the ministry, the Messianic programme. "The Spirit of the Lord (πνεῦμα κυρίου) is upon me for he has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor.." (Luke 4:18).<sup>2</sup> At 10:21 Luke declares that Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit (ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ) where Matt. 11:25 has simply "Jesus answered and said". Some mss. omit τῷ ἁγίῳ, but it seems likely that the words are original and that, by the expression, Luke wished to draw attention to the important saying which follows and which he

1 Schweizer, op.cit., p.37.

2 The quotation, which is composite in character, may reflect an oral tradition which recited these passages as having been spoken by Jesus at this point. It is possible that Jesus did make such a claim, though the Lucan setting may not be the actual or only occasion. E.F. Scott, The Spirit in the New Testament, (London, 1923) makes no reference to this verse in his chapter on the Synoptic Gospels, yet he states (p.77), "it may be confidently be inferred that the Holy Spirit was not a primary conception with Jesus". For the importance of this and other texts which proclaim the gift of the Spirit to Jesus, see W.C. van Unnik, "Jesus the Christ", NTS, VIII (1961-2) pp. 101-16. The author claims that the essential element in the Messiahship of Jesus for the early Christians was, not the outward activity of a king, but the person possessed by the Spirit. He believes that this was not invented by the Church, but rested upon the life and actions of Jesus. (p. 115).



may have thought to be an inspired or even ecstatic prophecy.<sup>1</sup> It is, at any rate, another instance of Luke's tendency to heighten the spirit-filled character of Jesus.

It is possible that a suggestion concerning the presence of the Spirit in Jesus underlies Luke 2:40. His growth and advance in wisdom (τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἤρξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πληρούμενον σοφίας) are described in terms parallel to those concerning John's development (τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἤρξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι 1:80), but the absence of πνεύματι in the description of Jesus may be significant. Is its omission meant to suggest that Jesus did not require to grow "in the spirit" since he already possessed it fully from his conception?<sup>2</sup> This argument invites two comments: (i) if Luke had meant to describe John's growth in the Spirit (i.e. in the Holy Spirit) we should expect to find ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. It therefore seems more likely that we are dealing with the psychological use of πνεῦμα to denote the deeper-than-physical level of a man's being, the inner personality, the spring of feeling and emotion, and not with a reference to the Spirit of God or the power of God imparted temporarily to man.<sup>3</sup> (ii) There is some evidence (A & Coine Peshitta Syr.) for πνεύματι at 2:40. If this is original, I Cf. E.F. Scott, op.cit., p.69.

2 Cf. Lampe op.cit., p.168 and Schweizer, op.cit., pp. 37-8.

3. The Bauer/Arndt and Gingrich Lexicon includes Luke 1:80 among the references to "human spirit".



we must claim that it was misunderstood of "the Spirit" and omitted in order to avoid the suggestion that Jesus required to grow in the Spirit after his birth and baptism: most probably, however, it was introduced from 1:80. In the Magnificat (1:47) τὸ πνεῦμα μου is parallel to ψυχῇ and is obviously used in a psychological sense to connote the seat of spiritual awareness.<sup>1</sup> At 9:55 some mss. (D & Marc.) give as part of the content of Jesus' rebuke to his disciples the words οὐκ οἶδατε ποίου πνεύματος ἔστε . Here πνεῦμα connotes "disposition or dominant attitude", but if the connection with Elijah is to be stressed, there may be a suggestion of the contrast between the spirit-inspiration of the prophet which could result in destructive action and the Spirit of the new dispensation. The first explanation is certainly to be preferred: the second would involve a strange use of πνεῦμα for the "spirit of a period or time".

In addition to 12 instances of πνεῦμα referring to the evil "spirits" of illness etc. the word is used by Luke in quotation from the LXX of Ps. 31:5, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου (23:46) where πνεῦμα (OT π-17) means "essential life-force" or simply "life". The same meaning

<sup>1</sup> On this verse, Schweizer, *op.cit.* p.38 n.1 says "Luke wishes to emphasise that it is not simply a human faculty which is the agent here, but the self which ultimately cannot be separated from God's Spirit and is bestowed on man". However far we may agree that the spirit of man is dependent on and inspired by God, Schweizer's interpretation here looks like the forcing of the plain meaning of an occurrence of πνεῦμα into a theological strait-jacket.



appears at Luke 8:55. In 24:37,39 πνεῦμα means "a spirit" in the sense of "ghost", visible, material in some sense, but precisely the opposite of ἐγὼ αὐτός (v.39).

Before we leave the discussion of the Synoptic Gospels it seems fitting to draw attention once again to the paucity of reference to the Spirit found in them. Only on a very few occasions can we, with any degree of certainty, find it in Jesus' actual teaching (Mark. 13:11 and parallels and 3:29 and parallels), and there is only one certain declaration that anyone other than Jesus shared in the gift of the Spirit (Mk. 13:11). In the portrait drawn of Jesus by the evangelists, the traits and descriptions of "a man of the spirit" (though present) are not given the prominence one might have expected. In fact the references to the Spirit in relation to Jesus are strictly subordinated to the theme of His Messiahship: the action of the Spirit is the proof that the Messianic Age has dawned. All the mighty works done in the power of the Spirit flow from His Messiahship. In other words, the Gospel writers were more concerned to present Jesus as Messiah than as a "pneumatic" man. There were plenty of these in the ancient world! The Messiah, however, was expected to be the bearer of the Spirit: why then is that characteristic not more prominent? The answer, according to C.K. Barrett, is that during the ministry the Messiahship was kept secret and therefore there could be no direct emphasis



on the Spirit. Barrett deals with the absence of reference to the gift of the Spirit to Jesus' disciples and suggests that the reason for this is as follows:

The Spirit was the possession of Jesus, as Messiah, alone, and in him it was veiled; and therefore, strictly speaking, there was no Church before the death of Jesus. The general gift of the Spirit belongs to the time of the vindication and manifestation of the Messiah and of the Messianic kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, this vindication and consummation was not, in the thought of Jesus, the emergence of the Church.

Jesus did not prophesy the existence of a Spirit-filled community, because he did not foresee an interval between the period of humiliation and that of complete and final glorification. He did not distinguish his resurrection and parousia, and, accordingly, there was no room for the intermediate event, Pentecost.<sup>2</sup>

And consequently no expectation of the life of the Church.

Here one is faced with very difficult problems concerning Jesus' eschatological thinking. Whether or not he foresaw the life of the Church in its post-Resurrection form cannot be known with certainty. But surely that uncertainty is of secondary importance to the known fact that Jesus gathered about himself a company of disciples who had answered his call, "Follow me". That society of men who were being transformed through their association with Jesus was, in some sense, the Church. By them, and by their successors, the ministry of the Messiah was and is continued. The Spirit which equipped Jesus for his ministry is upon those

<sup>1</sup> HSGT, p.159

<sup>2</sup> Op.cit., p.160.



whose task and privilege it is to continue that ministry. Scarcely anything is said about it in the Gospels, but is this not a tribute to the integrity of the early tradition? During the ministry, the inspired events took place, while the explanations of their source came later. Jesus said little about the power by which he acted: he was content to act, and the definitions of his power followed. Is Pentecost simply the community becoming conscious of the power it possesses for carrying on the Messianic ministry? - a power which Jesus assumed for it and therefore scarcely needed to declare as the inspiration of its work, both immediate and future.<sup>1</sup> Have we perhaps taken too much at face value the records of the mighty awareness of the Spirit in the early chapters of Acts, with result that we assume that circumstances so remarkable must have been foretold and promised by Jesus? Is it not possible that there is a magnifying of the sense of the Spirit's presence and power there, just as there is a magnifying of the degree of unity the Christians then possessed? In short, is there not a good deal of theology as well as history in the opening chapters of Acts? By saying all this, we would wish to suggest a greater degree of continuity between Jesus and the life of the Church than Barrett appears to admit. He overemphasises the death (and

---

<sup>1</sup> It is significant that the only trustworthy statement about the action of the Spirit among the disciples is that which promises its help to them in any time of extreme need in the carrying out of their ministry of witness.



resurrection) of Jesus as the prerequisite of the Church's existence, and therefore does less than justice to what lies before the death, namely, the Ministry. He regards this as, at most, a prelude to the real Messiahship, a veiled shadow of it, whereas the Ministry seems to us to be in fact the very content Jesus gave to the conception of Messiahship. For the activities of this Messianic ministry Jesus possessed the Spirit,<sup>1</sup> but talked little about it as the source of his power and inspiration. Likewise, those who have been brought into association with Him and whose activities are taken up into the continuation of His activity, these also share in the same power as the Master, and it is assured to them in times of crisis. On this general view, Pentecost becomes, not the birthday of the Church, but the occasion on which the faithful disciples realised the nature of the power that was to support them and inspire their life and action; and it was a realisation so dramatic and a power so great and so available that the records of these times do seem to suggest that it was the beginning of everything, that a new era had come, an era of the Spirit.

---

<sup>1</sup> We think it more than probable that Jesus applied to himself the word of Is. 61:1ff, as Luke 4:18 records.



Part 2. The Acts of the Apostles.

We have already seen that Luke's Gospel not only emphasises the relation of the Spirit to Jesus, but also stresses its availability to the faithful in Jesus' church (Luke 11:13 and the variant to 11:2). This latter concern with the Age of the Church is constantly evident in the Book of Acts. Statistics of usage reveal that of the 53 occasions on which the word  $\piνεῦμα$  appears in Acts meaning "Holy Spirit", 45 are in some way related to the life of the Church: thirteen times in connection with individuals in the Church (Peter, Stephen, Paul etc.), thirty-two times as promised to and endowed upon the community, experienced within it, guiding and expanding its mission, and bestowed also on the Gentiles. Of the eight remaining occasions, three refer to the Spirit as the inspirer of Holy Scripture (1:16, 4:25, 28:25), two to the Spirit resting on or guiding Jesus (1:2, 10:38), two to sinning against the Holy Spirit (5:3,9) and one to Israel resisting the Spirit (7:51, cf. Is. 63:10).

Before looking at these passages in detail, we may mention that  $\piνεῦμα$  is used eight times in Acts to denote "evil spirits" of uncleanness or disease (5:16, 8:7, 16:16 and 18; 19:12, 13, 15 and 16.) We are already familiar with this usage from the Synoptic Gospels, the Jewish Inter-testamental literature and the writings of both Judaism and Hellenism. A few instances of the use of  $\piνεῦμα$  to denote the "human



spirit" are also found. According to 7:59, Stephen dies with words reminiscent of Jesus' utterance at Lk. 23:46 on his lips: *Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*. Here *πνεῦμα* is the essential life-force or spirit given by God and returned to him at death. At 17:16 *πνεῦμα* refers to the seat of emotional disturbance, and at 19:21 to the seat of the will, although it is possible that the latter occurrence connotes the directing influence of the Spirit of God. Apollos is described at 18:25 as *βέων τῷ πνεύματι* : most scholars regard this phrase as descriptive of temperament, i.e. "fervent in spirit", but some wish to interpret it as "fervent in the Spirit". How could Apollos be fervent in the Spirit, if he knew only the baptism of John which was not a baptism in Spirit? The first view seems more satisfactory. At 20:22 we read that Paul went to Jerusalem *τῷ πνεύματι δεδεμένος*. This might represent an attempt to describe a sense of inward compulsion deriving from Paul's own will, but it seems much more likely that the reference is to a supernatural influence (i.e. the Holy Spirit) which controls and guides his movements, even on a journey which would lead to persecution and death. Consequently 20:22 really belongs to the "Holy Spirit" passages. Twice, at 23:8:9, we find the word *πνεῦμα* used to mean "a spirit", enjoying some kind of existence subsequent to the death of the body (cf. Luke 24:39).



We turn now to the use of πνεῦμα for the "Holy Spirit" and, first of all, to the three passages in which it is regarded as the inspirer of Scripture. "The Holy Spirit spoke through the mouth of David" in Ps. 41 concerning the death of, and the succession to Judas (Acts 1:16). God, through the mouth of David, spoke by the Holy Spirit (4:25); and the Holy Spirit spoke through Isaiah the prophet (28:25). In these verses, the (prophetic) Holy Spirit is regarded as the real source of the inspiration and the authority of Scripture in expressing the divine will and purpose. This theme, so common in the writings of Judaism, has its ultimate origin in the OT understanding of "spirit" as charisma.

Ananias and Saphira are accused of trying to deceive τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (5:3) and of agreeing to tempt or test the Spirit of the Lord, πειράσσει τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου (5:9). Whatever be the correct background for the understanding of this story - interpreted as a Christianising of the Achan story,<sup>1</sup> as an explanation of the incidence of death in the Christian community,<sup>2</sup> as based on the tradition that the surrender of private property was the condition of progressing from a novitiate to full membership of the community (as in

<sup>1</sup> G.W.H. Lampe, New Peake, ad loc. p.892. ἐνοσφίσατο recalls Joshua 7:1 (LXX).

<sup>2</sup> P.H. Menoud, "La Mort d'Ananias et de Saphira" Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne; Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel, (Paris. 1950) pp. 146-54.



Cumran)<sup>1</sup> - it is clear that it assumes that the Spirit supports and guides the Church's life to such an extent that failure to abide by the Community's rules is tantamount to transgression against the Holy Spirit. We may have here an illustration of Luke's understanding of the "sin against the Spirit" (Lk. 12:10) viz. speech or action against the constitutive factor of the Church's life. E. Haenchen<sup>2</sup> suggests that the story illustrates the belief of primitive Christianity (cf. 1 Cor. 14:14ff) that the spirit-filled man could predict and reveal the secrets of a man's being: in which case the original narrative may have concluded with the judgment, later tradition heightening the drama by introducing the death of the two sinners. According to this interpretation τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου must refer to the spirit of prophecy and insight present in the Church, and particularly in Peter. In this connection we may recall that the "vexing of the Holy Spirit" in Is. 63:10 means rejection of the prophets' witness. The speech of Stephen alludes to this verse from Isaiah: 7:51 "Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit (τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε)" and this is explained in the following verse, "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted...". The juxta-

<sup>1</sup> E. Trocmé, Le Livre des Actes et l'histoire (Paris, 1957) pp. 196ff, and J. Schmitt, Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte (Paris, 1957) pp. 93-109. Are the νεώτεροι (v.6) the novices or simply "youths"?

<sup>2</sup> Die Apostelgeschichte (Meyers Kommentar, 12. Aufl. Göttingen, 1959) pp. 197-98.



position of the verses reveals that the Holy Spirit is almost identified with the prophetic message of which it was the inspiration. Holy Spirit and prophetic activity are equivalent means of expressing the active, directing presence of God in the nation's life.

The two references to the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus are 1:2 and 10:38. The former passage may be interpreted in two ways, either that Jesus gave his commandment "by the Holy Spirit" (διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου) or that he chose his disciples "by the Holy Spirit". In either case, the phrase reaffirms the Spirit's guidance and inspiration in the ministry of Jesus. The kerygmatic summary of the ministry (10:38) declares that "God anointed (ἔχρισεν) Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power (πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει)". We see here a reference to the Spirit as the specific endowment or possession of the Messiah, the Anointed One - a theme we have discerned in our treatment of the Synoptic Gospels and which is characteristic of Luke's Christology.

The story of the strange, revolutionary event of Pentecost presents many problems, both theological and historical.<sup>1</sup> With these we are not directly concerned here, save to say that, even if some dramatic awareness of the

<sup>1</sup> See Haenchen op.cit. and C.S.C. Williams, The Acts of the Apostles (London 1957). Valuable background material is assessed by W.L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles, (Cambridge, 1948) pp. 81ff.



power of the Spirit was reported in the original source, and even if a written or oral tradition concerning it lies behind Acts 2, the narrative, as it now stands, is based upon, and intended to create in others, the conviction that the gift of the Spirit to the Church at Pentecost inaugurated a New Age, a new order of existence, a new Creation. What we are concerned to discover is the nature of the gift described, in the hope that this may help towards the solution of some of the problems of the story.

The opening verses of Acts 1 take the reader back to the closing verses of Luke's gospel, especially to 24:49, where Jesus declares to his disciples, "Behold I send the promise (ἐπαγγελία) of my Father upon you; but stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high (δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους)". The idea of spirit-endowment which the word δύναμις suggests is made explicit in Acts 1:4-5: "Wait for the promise of the Father, which, he said, you have heard of me: for John baptised with water, but before many days you shall be baptised with the Holy Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ)". The two terms δύναμις and πνεῦμα are brought together in v.8, where the Risen Christ is made to say, "You shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and ye shall be my witnesses, in Jerusalem, in all Judaea . . and unto the uttermost parts of the earth". The power of the promised Spirit will enable the Apostles to



witness. When the outpouring of Pentecost actually takes place the result is consistent with the expectation formed in chapter 1. "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues (ἐτέροις γλώσσαις), as the Spirit gave them utterance" (2:4). Representatives from every part of the then known world who were gathered at Jerusalem heard the mighty deeds of God, each in his own dialect (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ). Whatever interpretation we put upon this γλωσσολαλία, whatever allusions we find in the narrative (e.g. to the giving of the Law at Sinai), one thing is clear: the gift of the Spirit is regarded as an endowment which enables the Apostles and other Christians to communicate with all people: it makes possible and effective the preaching of the word and works of God. As it had endowed the Messianic ministry, so it endows those who continue and extend that ministry. That the declaration of God's acts is the central and decisive activity which the Spirit produces is shown by the quotation from Joel 2, concerning the eschatological outpouring: the endowment will result in prophesying (2:17, 18).

This understanding of the Spirit reappears at 4:31 (a verse which Harnack thought was the historical account of Pentecost): "When they (the Church) had prayed, the place was shaken... and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness". As G.W.H. Lampe puts



it, "The Spirit, as always, inspires and empowers the missionary enterprise".<sup>1</sup> At this point, the experience of the Spirit is renewed in the face of Jewish opposition, and the word is proclaimed μετὰ παρρησίας i.e. with freedom and conviction. When Peter declared God's actions in Christ before the Sanhedrin, he is described as being filled with the Holy Spirit (πλησθεὶς πνεύματος ἁγίου) 4:8 - a fulfilment of Luke 12:11-12. Again the wisdom and Spirit with which Stephen spoke to his disputants (6:10) could not be withstood, where πνεῦμα denotes inspired prophetic power rather than "spiritedness of utterance". Paul - "a chosen instrument to bear my name before the Gentiles, kings and the sons of Israel" - is filled with Holy Spirit to fulfil his task of proclamation (9:17). Furthermore, after the essential facts of the life of Jesus and of the Gospel have been declared to the Council, the apostles affirm that "we are witnesses to these things, and so is the Holy Spirit which God has given to those who obey him" (5:32). The witness or testimony of the Spirit, like that of the Apostles, is essentially concerned with the proclamation of the Good News.

The second Pentecostal endowment, that of the Gentiles, is recorded at 10:44ff, and is of the same character as the first. While Peter was speaking "the Holy Lamps, The Acts of the Apostles, New Peake, p. 892.



Spirit fell on all who heard the word". The Jewish Christians were amazed that the gift had been poured out on the Gentiles, "for they heard them speaking in tongues (γλῶσσαις) and extolling God". Presumably this was the proof of their having received the Spirit, and baptism followed. That Luke is so careful to record the same signs of spirit-possession on these two great occasions demonstrates clearly that for him, the "prophetic" character of the gift is central. It is the equipment for Gospel proclamation (cf. 11:15, 16; 13:8). The same understanding of the Spirit is found at 19:6. The disciples at Ephesus (who had known only John's baptism, and not the promised Spirit-baptism) received the Spirit and after baptism, "They spoke with tongues and prophesied."<sup>1</sup>

The traditional idea of prophetic spirit appears on a few occasions. Agabus foretold (σημαίνω) by the Spirit (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος) that there would be a famine, 11:28. Paul, filled with Holy Spirit, penetrated the hidden thoughts of Elymas and declared to him his own heart - a prophetic function (13:9 and cf. 5:9). The same character of the Spirit is found in those passages where its action provides a vision or forecast of the future (20:23, 21:4, 11.)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The difference in the order of Spirit-endowment and baptism in 10:44 and 19:6 will be discussed later.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 7:55 records that Stephen, "full of the Holy Spirit" had a vision of heaven before his death. This may be an instance of Luke's desire to draw a parallel between Jesus and Stephen in their deaths. The vision has the character of prophetic insight given to the witness (μάρτυς).



Several passages in Acts heighten the prophetic and missionary character of the Spirit by presenting it as equivalent to God's will for the missionary enterprise as this was experienced and interpreted by the Apostles: the Spirit provides direct instructions for concrete action in the expansion of the mission. For instance, it is the Spirit which tells Philip (8:29) to go and join himself to the chariot of the Ethiopian, a direction which brings him the opportunity of declaring the Gospel and winning a convert.<sup>1</sup> The Spirit creates the opening for missionary service. The same is true at 10:19 where the Spirit reveals to Peter that the men who will conduct him to Cornelius have come and urges him to accompany them. This instruction marks the first stage in the extension to Gentiles of membership in the Church, a significant step in the evangelistic cause (cf. 11:12). The Holy Spirit gave direction for Paul and Barnabas to be set apart for special work, and they "being sent out by the Holy Spirit" (ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος), undertook the mission in Cyprus (13:2,4). Again the Holy Spirit is regarded as the guiding agent in the missionary expansion. An interesting example of this theme is found at I "The Spirit of the Lord snatched away (ἄρπάζω) Philip" (8:39) is a strange statement. It resembles 2 Kings 2:16 where the possibility of the Spirit having snatched away Elijah is mentioned. The Western text - "The H.S. fell on the eunuch and the angel of the Lord snatched away P." - seems to be an attempt to clear away the difficulty. Perhaps the verse is no more than an attempt to show that the "missionary" Spirit had other preaching engagements for Philip elsewhere.



16:6-7 where it is recorded that the Spirit forbade the entry into Asia and Bithynia. This may imply some vision or prophetic message, but it is possible that it is really an attempt to explain an unsuccessful venture. Missionary action was controlled by the Spirit: if, in any area, the enterprise was not received and forwarded, it was a sign that the Spirit "forbade" the proclamation there.<sup>1</sup>

Thus far we have been concerned to draw forth what seems to be the primary emphasis in Luke's conception of the Spirit, namely, its essentially prophetic character, both as endowment and in its action.<sup>2</sup> Just as Jesus' claim to the Spirit's endowment for his ministry stands at the beginning of the Gospel record of the Messianic ministry (Luke 4:18), so the event of the Pentecostal endowment of the Church for its ministry of proclamation stands at the beginning of Acts. And that which is given is essentially the Spirit of prophecy, symbolised by the gift of tongues, for the inspired declaration of the mighty acts of the Gospel. Prophets no longer appear singly: all the Lord's people are prophets, preaching the word. In short, the gift of the Spirit is the power for Gospel preaching. Since

---

1 If, as some think, missionary work was already in progress in Asia, the Spirit as directing agent would not lead to territory which was being evangelised.

2 Thus Luke does not regard the Spirit as the direct source of gifts of healing, nor as the secret of the Church's community life. The gift of the Spirit is scarcely related to miraculous acts or moral renewal, but only to missionary enterprise.



this activity is such an integral part of the expansion of the Church's mission, it naturally follows that the Spirit is regarded (in a personalised way, cf. 13:2) as the controller of that mission, directing men to opportunities, selecting them for special tasks. They, as they continue the Messianic ministry, are Spirit-endowed, and the whole enterprise is Spirit-guided. When the Apostles say "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.." (15:28), they mean that the course of action chosen either had been or was expected to be successful in forwarding the missionary purpose.

The close association, even identification, of the gift of the Spirit with the power for missionary service, and in particular for the proclamation of the Gospel, may illumine the relation between the Spirit and Baptism. The pattern and meaning of Jesus' baptism is of importance here. The Synoptic theology (including Luke) interprets the Baptism of Jesus as his entry upon his Messianic ministry; as equipment to fulfil this vocation, the Spirit comes upon him. Baptism - the act of self-surrender - and the gift of the Spirit - the accession of power - form the prelude to that ministry. The book of Acts takes over this connection and applies it in the Church's life. Baptism is not merely a cleansing rite, but the symbol and the occasion of a man's willing self-identification with the community of believers,



to which, and to whose members individually, is given the missionary task of witness, the continuation of Christ's ministry. The equipment to fulfil this witness in speech and in life is the same as that given to Jesus, the power of God's Spirit. Consequently it is normal to find baptism, as the sign of conversion, preceding the endowment with Spirit. On the day of Pentecost, Peter declares to the people: "Repent and be baptised in the name of Jesus . . . and ye shall receive the gift", 2:38. In the case of the Ephesian disciples, who had experienced only John's baptism of repentance, there was no experience of the Spirit until they were baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus, until they were incorporated into Him and into His Church, and so were concerned in its mission (19:6). At 10:44-48 the endowment with the Spirit precedes baptism. But as G.W.H. Lampe says, "this episode is in no way typical; it is a major turning point in Luke's narrative, a second purely Gentile Pentecost"<sup>1</sup> and, as such, is described as parallel to the events of Acts 2.<sup>2</sup> The coming of the Spirit is direct and

<sup>1</sup> The Seal of the Spirit, (London, 1951) p.66.

<sup>2</sup> For the view that Acts 10:44ff preserves the original order of Spirit-endowment and baptism - an order truer to the Gospel principle of God approaching sinners while they are yet sinners - see T.W. Manson, "Entry into Membership of the Early Church", JTS, XLVIII, (1947) pp. 25-33. J.E. Yates, The Spirit and The Kingdom, takes over Manson's view of the originality of Acts 10:44 and uses it in drawing his distinction between the Spirit as agent and as gift. It is possible that Manson has done less than justice to the desire of Luke to make this second Pentecost in all points parallel to the first.



unmediated. This does not make baptism superfluous, but indicates that those whom God has chosen must be forthwith received into the Christian community. The Spirit has freedom and is not bound to or by institutional practice. The power for missionary service is the gift of God alone and He may give it to whom he will. This fact is emphasised by Luke in these accounts of the Jewish and Gentile Pentecosts, the key moments in the Church's expansion.

One question remains. Is there not evidence in 8:14ff that the gift of the Spirit is dependent upon a "laying on of hands" by the Apostles? Is the Spirit given only by the Apostolic ministry? Some writers have claimed that this is the case, supporting their position by suggesting that prayer and laying on of hands is the ritual of ordination and of confirmation. It would appear, however, that when we remember the dominance of the missionary motive throughout Acts and the missionary character of the Spirit's endowment, we shall see in the "laying on of hands" simply the symbol of the Church's incorporation of the individual(s) into the missionary task, and that for special office and humble service alike, since all believers are witnesses.<sup>1</sup>

Luke is concerned to delineate the progress of a missionary, not an institutionalised, Church, and therefore it is fair

1 Cf. Lampe, op.cit., pp.69ff and 306ff, also C.S.C. Williams, op.cit., pp. 291-93.



and reasonable to interpret what appears to be a statement on order and ritual from within that context. "Laying on of hands" does not mean the implanting of the Spirit; it symbolises incorporation into the community, and, on occasion, also the imparting of the right to undertake a special task. The Spirit is the gift of God's power to fulfil the duty and privilege of witnessing: it is not a substance controlled and imparted by the Apostles alone.

From this survey it is clear that for Luke the Spirit is the power which makes possible and guides the missionary expansion of the Church. The prophetic Spirit (so well-known in Jewish thought) is the means by which the Kerygma is communicated, and the mighty works of God made known in the world. It is the motive force to witness to the action of God in Jesus of Nazareth. Accordingly, the Spirit may be regarded as the controlling power of the whole missionary enterprise, through whose inspiration opportunities are given and events take shape. In all this, there is a real indebtedness to the Old Testament and to Jewish tradition: the Spirit gives power to fulfil a task or express faith. In the new dispensation, however, it is not a few individuals, but the entire Church, which is the bearer of the endowment, and the task is the prophetic proclamation of the Gospel of Christ. The experience of the



Spirit of God is directly connected with the extension of the work of the Messiah Jesus.

There is very little reference in Luke to the presence of the Spirit as the inner principle of the believer's life or as an abiding gift within the Church's life. It is used to describe the Christian character of the deacons (in association with "wisdom") at 6:3, of Barnabas at 11:24 and of Stephen at 6:5: its presence within the community is declared at 13:52 and 9:31. But the quality of koinonia within the Church is nowhere actually stated to be the creation of the Spirit, the inward bond of unity. In Luke's view, the gift of the Spirit is the power to missionary enterprise, not church cohesion or a quality of Christian living. Nevertheless, it is probably legitimate to assume that the vitality of Christian experience and the unity manifested in the early days of the Church were, in fact, due to this experience and understanding of the Spirit. In declaring and spreading the Good News, in its involvement in missionary service, the Community was made one in purpose and action, and the faith of each member strengthened and enriched.

### Part 3. The Writings of Paul.

In the writings of Paul, unlike the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, the word πνεῦμα is never used to denote the demons or spirits which cause disease or mental derangement. There is one instance of the word used to mean "breath": "The Lord



Jesus will slay the lawless one with the breath of his mouth (τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ )" (2 Thess. 2.8), a quotation from LXX Is. 11:4. The two main uses of the word in Paul are (i) with reference to the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and (ii) with reference to the human spirit. Almost all the occurrences of the word in his letters belong to one or other of these two classes.

It is difficult to systematise Paul's use of πνεῦμα when it means "the Spirit (of God)" or "Holy Spirit". A beginning may be made, however, from 1 Cor. 12-14 in which the Apostle criticises popular conceptions of the Spirit and attempts to bring some order into the Corinthians' confused understanding of its inspirational activity. Among the Corinthians the ability to speak in tongues (γλωσσολαλία ) was regarded as the supreme, if not the only, endowment of the Spirit. Here we are in touch with an aspect of Hellenistic religious thought, within which the "speaking in tongues" was considered as a sign of intense spirituality and of possession by the god who inspired the utterance.<sup>1</sup> Now Paul rates this psychological gift below the moral gifts

<sup>1</sup> Some interpreters try to find a relation between the γλωσσολαλία at Corinth and the Pentecostal "speaking in tongues". We have already suggested, however, that Luke's narrative of Pentecost is governed by a theological motif - the Spirit as the power which makes possible the proclamation of the Gospel and the spread of the missionary movement. Therefore His statements on γλωσσολαλία should not be taken too literally. The Corinthian γλωσσολαλία is one instance of a phenomenon common at all times, viz. the gift or ability to utter noises, when under deep emotional stress, or under the influence of hypnosis.



of the Spirit. He does not deny that it is a gift of the Spirit, but he wants it kept in its rightful place. Prophecy or preaching is the spiritual gift to be desired most. A person who speaks with tongues may be at one with the god himself: he may enjoy a secret communion, but he communicates nothing (except by an interpreter) to his audience: but anyone who prophesies (under the inspiration of the Spirit) builds up the Church by his preaching and strengthens his hearers (14:2ff). Prophecy, therefore, is not mere prediction but the delivery of God's message to men, and the Spirit, which is its source, is, as in Acts, the power for Gospel proclamation. Thus we see Paul evaluating the endowments of the Spirit according to the principle - Is this gift constructive πρὸς τὴν οἰκὸδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας? According to this criterion, not all are equally valuable: glossolalia, though highly esteemed, is less important than the gift which enables a man to declare the truth of the Gospel, and the supreme gift of all is ἀγαπή .

From these chapters another important point emerges. The Corinthians probably believed in many spirits, giving many varied gifts: for Paul, there are many gifts, but only one Spirit: διαίρεσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα (12:4). To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit (ἡ φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος) for the common good (12:7) and the manifestation of spiritual endowment is



seen in the functions of the various members within the Body. The gift may be a word of wisdom (moral teaching?) or a word of knowledge, or a deep faith, or a gift of ability to heal or work miracles, to preach, to discern spirits, or (last in the list) to speak in tongues or interpret them. But all these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, the single origin of the various gifts among the members. "There is one Body and one Spirit" (Eph. 4:4<sup>1</sup>) and fellowship or participation in that Spirit (κοινωνία πνεύματος), Phil. 2:1 should contribute to unity,<sup>2</sup> which will reveal itself in common purpose and concern for others.

A little may be said about the various gifts which are the Spirit's endowments (1 Cor. 12:8-10). Account has already been taken of the gift of tongues. It is possible that Paul again alludes to it at 1 Thess. 5:19-20 - τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε - if this passage draws attention to two manifestations of the Spirit (glossolalia and prophecy) rather than refers to the single gift of prophecy under two forms.<sup>3</sup> The ability to work cures

<sup>1</sup> Even if Eph. was not written by Paul, its theology is Pauline.

<sup>2</sup> While, in some modern thinking, the Spirit stands for individual freedom against institutionalism, for Paul, the experience of the Spirit is essentially meaningless apart from the Church. The Corinthians believed that personal possession of the Spirit set men apart and justified individualism. Paul rejected this and insisted that the Spirit is one, and that all manifestations of it build up the Church.

<sup>3</sup> Schweizer, op.cit., p.65 suggests that prophecy is one form under which the exceptional character of πνεῦμα is revealed.



and miracles (ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων) is included among the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:9-10). That the charismatic activity of the Spirit attests itself in δύνάμεις is implied at Gal. 3:5,<sup>1</sup> and the working of signs and wonders forms part of Paul's ministry in the power of the Spirit (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος) Rom. 15:19. The inclusion of πίστις in the list of the Spirit's gifts probably means that the word is to be understood as "trust" in the miraculous power of God to perform signs through human agents, rather than as the personal relationship of faith in Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 13:2). The gifts to which Paul gives priority in his list are λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως (1 Cor. 12:8). While this particular passage suggests that the emphasis lies on λόγος, as the Spirit-inspired word or message of wisdom and knowledge declared within the Church, other passages in Paul make it clear that the possession of σοφία and γνώσις depends on the Spirit.<sup>2</sup> But this "wisdom" and "knowledge" are both of God and of the way of salvation, not worldly cleverness. For instance, Paul tells the Corinthians that he came to them, not with the wisdom of the world, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power (ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως) 1 Cor. 2:4. Nevertheless, he goes on to declare, there is a

1 Cf. E.D. Burton, Galatians, (ICC) p. 151.

2 The association of Wisdom with the Spirit is found in the Intertestamental literature, while the relation of divine Spirit to inspired knowledge is expressed by Philo (Sig. 22ff) and in the Old Testament, Ex. 31:2ff.



wisdom of God (θεοῦ σοφία ἐν μυστηρίῳ) which the spiritually mature (τελείοι) receive, a wisdom which enables the Christian to know the purpose of God in the victory of Christ over all hostile powers.<sup>1</sup> This is revealed through the Spirit, which alone can know the things of God (v.11), and is communicated only to those who possess the Spirit. The πνευματικοί here are not "ecstatics"<sup>2</sup> but those who are illumined by the revealing Spirit, and so understood the Gospel of the Cross: they are mature, full-grown Christians who can perceive spiritual truths and who have "the mind of Christ".<sup>3</sup> The content of the Spirit-endowed knowledge is, however, not restricted to the meaning of the victory of the Cross, it includes the apprehension of our Sonship. The Spirit enables the believer to say, "Abba, Father": it bears witness that he is a son of God (Rom. 8:15-16). Moreover, the presence and the testimony of the Spirit reveal that the

1 The knowledge is of τὰ βέβαια τοῦ θεοῦ (2:10): the expression is Gnostic, but Paul uses it with Christian meaning to refer to the spiritual truths about the purpose of God in Christ.

2 For a discussion and criticism of Reitzenstein's theory that this term and almost all Paul's uses of πνεῦμα are developed from Hellenistic mysticism, see H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, (London, 1913) and Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 191-200.

3 In 1 Cor. 2:16 Paul quotes Is. 40:13 ("Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord") in the LXX version τίς ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; He apparently equates πνεῦμα and νοῦς. The Spirit which reveals the mind of God is essentially related to Christ. The mature Christian is united to God through Christ and to that extent knows God's mind. On the non-Stoic character of this verse, see Davies, op.cit., p.182 note 6.



believers know God, or rather are known by God ( $\gamma\omega\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\dot{\upsilon}\mu\acute{o}\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ), i.e. are acknowledged by God as his own. Gal. 4:6f.

Paul's conception of the Spirit as the source and inspiration of special gifts - tongues, prophecy, miracles, wisdom and knowledge - is essentially in harmony with OT and Jewish ideas of charismatic endowment from God. There may be some Hellenistic influence at work in Paul's general idea of the revelation by the Spirit as consisting in higher truth and understanding hidden from sense and reason, but in the main he avails himself of that view of the Spirit which was an inheritance from Hebrew thought. It is a view characteristic alike of the Gospels and Acts, but in the writings of the Apostle, an extension of reference and emphasis can be discovered. In Acts the supernatural endowment is pre-eminently the power to declare the Gospel message in missionary enterprise, but in Paul, many other actions and abilities are regarded as Spirit-inspired. Moreover, there is a greater awareness of the Spirit's action within the life of the individual believer. To this we now turn as we consider the function of the Spirit in the Christian life.

(a) The Spirit in relation to initiation into Christian life.

It will be remembered that we suggested that the baptism with water and spirit in Acts reflected the pattern and meaning of Jesus' baptism, and symbolised, not only



cleansing, but self-identification with the community which accepts the way of Jesus, and the equipment with power to carry on His ministry. Now Paul expresses the same basic idea in his own characteristic terminology: 1 Cor. 12:13 "We were all baptised by (in) one Spirit (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ) into one Body, and all were made to drink of one Spirit". Incorporation into the Body of Christ - the instrument of Christ's continuing ministry - is ascribed to the power of the Spirit, communicated in baptism. Since inclusion in the Body by baptism and inclusion in the saving events of the Cross and Resurrection (i.e. justification) are ultimately the same thing, the latter can also be ascribed to the action of the Spirit: 1 Cor. 6:11, ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιασθητε, ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, where ἡγιασθητε may contain the suggestion of being attached to the Body of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

The receiving of the Spirit, as the mark of the beginning of the Christian life, is referred to in Gal. 3:2-3: "Did ye receive the Spirit by works of law or by a hearing with faith: (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;). Are ye so foolish? having begun (ἐναρξάμενοι) with the Spirit, are ye now ending with the flesh?" Here Paul is alluding to the Jewish belief that the Spirit is a reward acquired by an effort of perseverance in the law. According

1 Cf. J. Hering, La Première Épître de St. Paul aux Corinthiens, (Commentaire du NT, Num. VII, Paris 1949) p.45.



to the Apostle, the Galatians did not receive the gift of the Spirit thus, but by accepting the Gospel and committing themselves to Christ in faith. That he has in mind especially, though not necessarily exclusively, the charismatic manifestations of Spirit-endowment, evidenced by outward signs, is suggested by the reference to δυνάμεις in v.8,<sup>1</sup> which in effect repeats the question of v.2: ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; Again, Gal. 3:14 speaks of the receiving of the promise of the Spirit (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος) i.e. the promised Spirit, through faith.<sup>2</sup> In connection with these verses two important points may be noted. First, Paul, in declaring that the endowment of the Spirit can be and is a reality of experience, is affirming that the era of the Spirit, the Messianic era, has come. The active presence of the Spirit in power was to be a sign of the Endzeit, and therefore the advent of the power of the Age to come lent reality to the Messianic claims of Christ. Secondly, the experience of the Spirit's power is dependent on "faith", which, for Paul, meant submission to Christ, the acknowledgement of the legitimacy of his claims, and a total self-committal to Christ in his death and resurrected life. This

I E.D. Burton, op.cit., p.147.

2 In the phrase "the promise of the Spirit" Paul may be referring to Joel 2, or, through knowledge of a tradition behind Acts 1:5, to a promise of Jesus: he uses the expression here as explanatory of "the blessing of Abraham".



surrender means the end of the old life: the Spirit creates new life and sustains it.

(b) The Spirit in relation to the character of Christian living.

For Paul the whole of the Christian life in its ethical aspects is the expression of the activity of the Holy Spirit. This is an emphasis which is not prominent in Acts, where the Spirit is understood mainly in terms of endowment for mission, although that experience and understanding of the Spirit must have created a certain quality of Christian living, and so may be regarded as having some moral significance. Consequently, when Paul directly insists upon the Spirit as the source of Christian morality, he is not necessarily at variance with the conception of the Spirit in the primitive Church,<sup>1</sup> nor is he reversing the thought of Rabbinic Judaism.<sup>2</sup> We admit that in Judaism the Spirit was considered chiefly as the reward for achievement in works of obedience, rather than as the source of good works, but this surely cannot be taken to mean that the Rabbis would have denied that the Spirit itself was conducive to morality. That this thought finds scarcely any expression in their writings is probably due to the fact that they denied the

<sup>1</sup> H. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, (Göttingen, 1888) pp. 72 ff. regarded the Pauline teaching as a transformation of the idea of the Spirit in the early Church.

<sup>2</sup> This was the opinion of Lagrange, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ, (Paris, 1931) p.443.



presence and action of the Spirit in their generation.<sup>1</sup> If there was only a faint awareness of the activity of the Spirit in the age, then morality could hardly be considered as inspired by it. Paul, on the other hand, was dominated by the conviction that the Age of the Spirit had come. Life "in the Spirit" was both a possibility and a necessity for Christian believers: Christianity was essentially "pneumatic" and therefore the ethical aspect of the Spirit's activity was given great significance. Furthermore, the Spirit had already acquired ethical character in OT thought: the Spirit would create in the revived Israel of Ezekiel's vision a new heart, and the heart was the centre of decision and motive: it was the Spirit which would endow the Messianic ruler with wisdom, counsel and righteousness. Paul was not declaring anything radically new in ethicising the Spirit: he was emphasising what had been present in the OT, and what was implicit, if only rarely expressed, in Jewish thinking.

The clearest expression of the Spirit's relation to Christian living is at Gal. 5:22. Paul has affirmed the mutual contrariety of life under the leading of the Spirit and life in obedience to the impulses of the flesh. He goes on to contrast the characters of life which each principle produces: "The fruit of the Spirit (ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος) is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Davies, op.cit., pp. 219-20.



faith (or faithfulness), meekness, self-control,"<sup>1</sup> whereas "the works of the flesh are fornication, uncleanness etc". Under the term "fruit of the Spirit" are included the ethical qualities and spiritual experiences which were not popularly thought of as evidence of the Spirit's presence, but which, to Paul's mind, were of as great, and probably greater, value than the spectacular  $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ <sup>2</sup> of tongues, healing etc. which won popular acclaim. The Christian can produce these fruits of the Spirit because he has died to the flesh, having shared in Christ's crucifixion (Gal. 2:20), and thereby entered a new, risen life. That the body is the "temple of the indwelling Spirit" ( $\nu\alpha\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ), 1 Cor. 6:19, is the ground on which Paul can demand ethical purity and holiness. The whole matter is succinctly stated in Gal. 5:25:  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \beta\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ ,\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$  , which means that, since we have entered a new life in the Spirit and by its power, we must behave accordingly: we must conduct ourselves according to the

<sup>1</sup> In our discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls we mentioned the affinity between this list and the list of characteristics of the Spirit of truth in 1QS 4:2ff. The contexts also are similar, in that Paul (like the Manual) is discussing the principle or power on which life may be founded. To "walk  $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ " is to have life controlled from within by the Spirit of Christ.

<sup>2</sup> In the list of the manifestations of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12) and this list of the fruits of the Spirit,  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$  alone is common, and it is used with a different sense in the two places: here it means faithfulness and fidelity (to another), and in 1 Cor. specific trust in God to work miracles.



Spirit (as norm), which is, at the same time, the source of power for Christian behaviour.<sup>1</sup> These verses from Galatians leave no doubt that Paul considered the "spirit" to be a power working within men, influencing the will and producing conduct of a moral kind in which personal relationships are of crucial importance (5:26). But the power is not an impersonal force: nor, as the norm of life and conduct, is it an impersonal ideal. Both the standard and the power<sup>2</sup> are grounded in something real and something personal, because they are essentially related to Jesus Christ and men's continuing experience. Of this we shall say more when we discuss the Spirit and Christ.

(c) The Spirit as the "earnest" of final salvation.

The view of the Spirit as "the anticipation of the end in the present"<sup>3</sup> seems to have been introduced by Paul at 2 Cor. 1:22. He and his converts (he says) were made over to God through Christ, consecrated, marked with His seal (in baptism) and given τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.<sup>4</sup> This word means "down-payment or deposit", given as a guar-

1 Cf. P. Bonnard, L'Épître de St. Paul aux Galates, (Commentaire du NT, Paris, 1953) p. 118.

2 In this two-fold understanding of the Spirit as standard and as power, there is a certain likeness to what we found to be the content of the phrase "holy Spirit" (lit. "Spirit of holiness") in Ps. 51.

3 O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, (E.T. London, 1951) p.72.

4 The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος is epexegetic, not partitive: so Héring, La Seconde Épître de St. Paul aux Corinthiens, (Paris, 1958) p.28.



antee that the remainder would be delivered later. The Spirit, then, is the first instalment of something to be consummated, an assurance that God's promises (v.20) will be fulfilled. Later in the same letter (5:5) the term is used again and the context makes it clear that the presence of the Spirit is regarded as the guarantee of the resurrection state, the security that our longing for the "heavenly covering" will be satisfied. Again at Rom. 8:23 the Spirit is declared to be ἀπαρχή, - the first-fruits of the harvest which assures the delivery of the whole - and the reference is to the present anticipation of final salvation, the final acceptance into God's family and the redemption of the body in the New Creation of the future Age. The letter to the Ephesians reiterates this theme: Having believed in Christ, the Ephesian Christians "were sealed by the holy Spirit of the promise (perhaps "the promised Holy Spirit"), which is the earnest of our inheritance unto the redemption of the possession (ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως)", 1:13-14. The gift of the Spirit is the assurance of our inheritance in the eschatological redemption, when God shall claim his own. The present possession of the Spirit means that part of the future bliss is already attained, and equally that part still remains future, still unpossessed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Barrett, HSBT, p.153 and H. Gunkel, op.cit., p.63. Also J. Behm, ἀρραβὼν TWNT, I, p.474.



Having discovered the significance of the terms  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$ , we must go on to ask what it means to declare that the Spirit is a down-payment, and what understanding of the Spirit ( $\piνε\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ ) and its functions makes it possible to apply to it such terms? Does Paul mean that the fact of the Spirit's presence and action is itself a guarantee of something fuller? Or is it possible to be more explicit? Sanday and Headlam have suggested that the possession of the gifts of the Spirit (the moral and spiritual gifts as well as the charismata) serve to quicken the sense of yet greater gifts to come.<sup>1</sup> We would submit the hypothesis that the conception of the Spirit as "guarantee" originates from the character of Christian living and from the Christian's experience of the Spirit's action in certain areas of his faith and hope. The life of man, even within the fellowship of Christian faith, is marked by its incompleteness, or rather, its unfulfilled character. Evidence of this unfulfilledness appears at the levels of knowledge, of communion with God, of power and freedom in Christian living, and of the desire for eternal life. It is, however, on these four levels that the experience of the Spirit creates the expectation of completeness and fulness.

(1) Knowledge is partial: "Now we see through a glass darkly" (1 Cor. 13:8,12); but knowledge will one day be complete. That I Commentary on Romans (ICC) p.209 on Rom. 8:23.



which is present and that which is future are both given by the Spirit. Paul prays that God will bestow upon the Ephesians the Spirit of wisdom and revelation (πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως) in the knowledge of him (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ), "the eyes of your understanding being enlightened that ye may know (εἰς τὸ εἶδέναι ὑμᾶς) what is the hope of your calling and the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints" (1:17-18).<sup>1</sup> Knowledge of eschatological realities is the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit alone reveals the mystery of the victory of Christ's cross, and the revelation is discerned only by those who have received the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:7). In short, man cannot know the things of God: the first stages of insight into his will and purpose depend solely on the illumination of the Spirit, which is also the ground of the fuller revelation and understanding in the future.

(ii) The Spirit's inspiration is the pledge of a deeper communion with God. "We do not know how to pray as we ought: but the Spirit itself (αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα) intercedes for us with wordless utterances", Rom. 8:26ff. In other words, the Spirit, giving shape and value to our aspirations, leads to communion with God. It is the source of access to God in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. Masson, L'Épître de St. Paul aux Éphésiens, (Paris, 1953) p.153 says of the Spirit here, "Il s'agit bien sans doute d'un don que les croyants ont à recevoir, mais d'un don divin destiné à les rendre capables d'une connaissance spirituelle, qui . . . est plus particulièrement d'ordre eschatologique".



prayer (cf. Eph.6:18) and the inspirer of worship (Phil.3:3,<sup>1</sup> Eph. 5:18). This activity of the Spirit points beyond itself to fuller and more immediate communion with God.

(iii) We have already mentioned the importance for Paul of the ethical aspect of the Spirit as the source and power of Christian living.<sup>2</sup> Love, joy, peace and "every victory won" in the moral sphere are the fruits of the Spirit. But the Christian's achievement, in the power of the Spirit, has only begun. Righteousness is incomplete, but "through the

Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness (ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα) Gal. 5:5, where δικαιοσύνη refers to ethical character as well as to forensic standing. It is by the Spirit's power that we await and expect to attain righteousness and final justification (cf. Phil. 3:9).

(iv) At Gal. 6:8 the harvest of the Spirit is "life eternal", and at 2 Cor.5:5 its presence is the guarantee of the eternal heavenly dwelling of the future state. The life of man, when the Spirit of God is active and present in it, is the first instalment of the life that is eternal. The gift of the Spirit here and now is, in fact, the substance of Paul's "inaugurated eschatology". Just as in the Synoptic Gospels, I Reading οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες instead of θεῷ.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. 8:28 would also belong to this theme, if the verse is interpreted "with those who love God, the Spirit co-operates for good"; for which see M. Black, "The Interpretation of Rom.8:28" in Neotestamentica et Patristica, (Festschrift O. Cullmann, Leiden, 1962) pp. 166-72.



the Kingdom of God breaks into the present in the life and ministry of Jesus, so, in Paul, the future age breaks into the present in the action of the Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

We turn now to the discussion of Paul's expressions "being in the Spirit" and "walking in the Spirit". It has been claimed that these phrases reveal the influence of Stoic ideas upon the Apostle's thought. According to this view, Paul developed his conception of the Spirit in harmony with the Stoic idea of the world-soul (anima mundi), the cohesive principle of power in the universe, the spirit which permeates the whole world and infuses itself into the souls of men. In terms of this background, the Spirit would require to be interpreted in materialistic terms, and J. Weiss actually described it as "a fluid which surrounds us and also penetrates us",<sup>2</sup> an idea which he naturally traced to Stoicism. W.D. Davies has sought to show that the physical or material conception of the Spirit, which he thinks may be occasionally found in Paul (e.g. 1 Cor. 13:14), need not necessarily be due to Stoic influence: within Rabbinic Judaism, he maintains, the Spirit is often conceived in material terms.<sup>3</sup> However, it seems doubtful whether this can

<sup>1</sup> Cf. N.Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, (SJT Occasional Papers, No. 6, Edinburgh, 1957) chap. 2.

<sup>2</sup> History of Primitive Christianity, (ET, 2 Vols, London, 1937) vol. 2, p.464.

<sup>3</sup> Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 182ff.



be considered as parallel to the materialistic conception of the Spirit attributed to Paul, since the materialistic terms used by the Rabbis are only attempts to describe, in metaphors, the Spirit's action, not definitions of its substance. In any case, a prior question must be raised. Is there, in fact, any trace of a material conception of the Spirit in Paul? As we have just mentioned, the expressions often regarded as suggesting such a conception are "being in the Spirit", "walking in the Spirit" and "the indwelling Spirit": the first two (it is claimed) requiring us to think of the Spirit in terms of an atmosphere in which we live, and the third in terms of a penetrating fluid. Is this the most likely explanation? In interpreting these phrases we would recall the OT and Jewish view of the Spirit of God as power, the personal and present action of God within the lives of individuals and in the community, creating righteousness and causing renewal. Now for Paul, the greatest manifestation of God's presence and action in history was the life, death, and especially the resurrection of Jesus. The Messianic ministry was the scene of the activity of God's Spirit, and through the Resurrection Christ himself had become "life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45), that is, the power acting upon men which leads to true life, and which we might consider as the "presentness" (through effective remembrance) of the person and work of Christ, which exerts a recreating



influence upon man's total life. We shall have more to say on this when we consider the relation of the Spirit to Christ, but already the direction in which we must seek the explanation of the phrases ἐν πνεύματι, κατὰ πνεῦμα is becoming apparent. Πνεῦμα does not mean a rarified atmosphere or pervasive fluid: it is the present, continuing and powerful impact on man of the total Christ-event, a transforming power which, when acknowledged and allowed to mould life, will produce the fruits of righteousness and moral renewal.<sup>1</sup> It is not a material substance, nor an impersonal force: it is intensely personal, because it is the power or influence of a life lived acting upon the lives of men and women. "To live in or by the Spirit" means to recognise that the Spirit - the power of Christ's life in the here and now - is the only means of achieving full life: to act accordingly is to walk κατὰ πνεῦμα, allowing the impact of Christ's life to be determinative of all conduct.<sup>2</sup>

Probably the most significant single passage in which these and related themes find expression is Rom. 8:1-11. "Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus (τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ἡμεῖς). For the law of the

I Our discussion of the DSS material brought us to a similar conclusion concerning the character and function of the "spirit of truth". For Paul, however, the delineation of the Spirit was governed by the person of Jesus Christ.

2 Cf. Schweitzer, op.cit., p.76 "Walking in the Spirit is man's 'Yes' to the power of God which he cannot control, and which, instead of his own power, must now determine his life."



spirit of life in Christ Jesus (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) has made me free from the law of sin and death". Here the word νόμος does not mean a code of rules, but rather the determining influence of the Spirit which produces regulated action.<sup>1</sup> To live with this authority as the norm and guide for all life is to "walk according to the Spirit (περιπατεῖν κατὰ πνεῦμα)", 8:4. To walk thus is "to have one's mind set on the Spirit" and that will result in life and peace. In other words, to have one's whole life determined, not by the immediate and the physical (σάρξ), but by the Spirit, the power of Christ's life, brings life and peace, the latter not only as a subjective experience, but also as an objective relationship with God. The Apostle goes on to affirm:

You are in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι) if, as is the case, the Spirit of God dwells in you (εἴπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). If anyone has not the Spirit of Christ (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ) he does not belong to Him; but if Christ is in you... the Spirit is life itself because you have been justified.

That is to say, to be "in the Spirit" is to have the Spirit dwelling within, to have the influence of Christ's life as the inward controlling power in all conduct. If the Spirit's power is not present, there is no Christian life whatsoever: where it is present, there is life because of a right relationship to God. The vistas of life in the Spirit extend

I Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p.190.



beyond this mortal life. "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in you, then he who raised up Christ Jesus from the dead will quicken (ζωοποιήσῃ) your mortal bodies, διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν ", v.11. The genitive case after διὰ is the commonly accepted reading and stresses the active function of the Spirit, in virtue of which man will be revived. The accusative case, however, is well attested<sup>1</sup> and would imply the general state of the believer's life (life according to the Spirit) in consideration of which God will give life to mortal bodies. The second alternative seems to be in harmony with the general content of the passage and may be correct. Both readings, however, lead to the same conclusion, namely, that the Spirit is of decisive importance for the coming into existence and sustaining of the future life.

The phrases κοινῶνία πνεύματος at Phil. 2:1 and κοινῶνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος at 2 Cor.13:13 are subject to more than one interpretation. It is very doubtful that they mean "fellowship with or in the Spirit". The choice lies between "sharing or participation in the Spirit" and "fellowship created by the Holy Spirit" among those united in the One Body.<sup>2</sup> In either case, the idea of a material substance

<sup>1</sup> See Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., pp. 198-99 for details.

<sup>2</sup> See Davies, op.cit., p.178 and J. Hering, op.cit., p.105. The first interpretation is chosen by J.Y. Campbell, JBL, LI, (1932) p. 378-80.



is incorrect: πνεῦμα connotes the power which may be experienced within by men and women, and which creates unity and fellowship among those who submit to and are guided by it.

By way of introduction to the discussion of the relation of the Spirit to Christ, we may consider some further points from the passage Rom. 8:1-11. Paul's use of the various expressions describing the Christian life suggests that the Spirit within (πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν v.9) is equated with "Christ within" (v.10), that the "Spirit of God" and the "Spirit of Christ" have no difference in meaning and that to be "in the Spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι v.9) is equivalent to being "in Christ". Despite the interchangeability of these expressions, we cannot claim that Paul is identifying Christ and the Spirit, the very phrase "Spirit of Christ" (v.9) would contradict such a view. What Paul is trying to express is the relation of Christ to the Spirit in experience. The experience of the Spirit as the inner power moulding and controlling life is virtually the same as the experience of the indwelling Christ, of having Christ at the very centre of the personality. This means the making present and effective to the life of the believer of the power and influence of the whole Christ-event. If that is indeed the function of the Spirit, then to live under the control of the Spirit is certainly equivalent to having



"Christ within" as a living, guiding presence. The importance of this virtual identification of the experience of the Spirit with the experience of the indwelling Christ has been accurately stated by C.H. Dodd:

It saved Christian thought from falling into a non-moral, half-magical conception of the supernatural in human experience, and it brought all 'spiritual' experience to the test of the historical revelation of God in Christ.

1

We turn now to those passages which directly relate the Spirit to Christ, and first we look at Gal. 4:6, "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba, Father'" (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). By means of the use of ἐξ αποστέλλω Paul suggests a close parallel between the action of God in sending Christ (v.4) and in sending the Spirit into the hearts of men (v.6). The objective, once-for-all coming of Christ is experienced within as the power of the Spirit, which enables the believer to share the same attitude of sonship to God as did Christ himself. Christ's Spirit is Christ active, operative within man in the here-and-now.

At Phil. 1:19 Paul assures his readers that, through their prayers and the equipment of the Spirit of Christ (διὰ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), imprisonment and the prospect of martyrdom will not break his relationship with Christ. Although the reference may be to the Spirit of power possessed by Jesus, it seems more likely that Paul has

I The Epistle to the Romans, (MNTC) p.124.



in mind the impact upon him, in his situation, of the remembrance of the life of Christ, who, without flinching, faced and endured martyrdom. "For me", says Paul, "to live is Christ": "my life is formed by the pattern and the power of the living Christ". Therefore, to be equipped with an immediate, dynamic sense of Christ's presence will assist him in maintaining courage and faithfulness.<sup>1</sup>

We turn now to the much-discussed statement at 2 Cor. 3:17a, ὁ δὲ κυρίως τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν. The context assists our interpretation here. The meaning of πνεῦμα in v.17 must be sought for in its antithesis to μέλαν in v.3 and γράμμα in v.6. The epistle of Christ - which is the Corinthian church - has been written, not "with ink", but "with the Spirit of the living God", i.e. their Christian life has been created by, and at the same time demonstrates, the power of the Spirit: and that suggests that the Spirit is the means by which God is active in his Church. Moreover, the epistle of Christ is written by the Spirit in the hearts of men: the Spirit is experienced as a power operative within a man, in his heart, Paul declares that his ministry is concerned with this new Covenant of the Spirit which gives life (v.6), and not with the old written code which kills.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hamilton, op.cit., p.15, "The Spirit mediates the presence of the Lord". In connection with this idea of the Spirit's function, the place of memory, knowledge of the tradition concerning Jesus, and even of imagination, would make an interesting topic for investigation.



The verses which follow expound the superiority of the new over the old, by comparing the splendour or glory (δόξα) which they can promise, and they explain how the transfer from the old to the new may take place. The splendour of the old Covenant was a fading one (v.7) and in fact has faded away, but the splendour of the dispensation of the Spirit is such as will transform its beholders into ever-increasing glory (18). It is the conviction of present and future glory that gives Paul "boldness" (παρρησία). This freedom is contrasted with the "veil" (κάλυμμα) of Moses (12-15), the symbol of the partial understanding and the partial revelation of the Law. To be freed from bondage to what is only partial, one must turn to the Lord (v.16, quoting Ex. 34:34). Now the "Lord", in this context, must, for Paul, refer to Christ, since v.14 clearly states that "only in Christ is it (the veil) removed". Verse 17 goes on to declare, "Now the Lord is the Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα)", that is, the Lord to whom we can turn for illumination and for understanding is the Spirit, that Spirit which is experienced as life-giving, liberating power within, and which is the means by which Christ is operative in the Church. "Wherever the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (17b). The passage ends with the declaration that the process of illumination and transformation into the likeness of the Lord is brought about καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος, i.e. as from,



or as by, the Lord who is experienced as Spirit (not, "by the Lord of the Spirit").

By reason of the fact that "turning to the Lord" achieves what only Christ can do, v.17a presents us with a virtual identification of Christ and the Spirit: but it is not an identification of essence or nature, but of function, in terms of Christian experience. The means by which we encounter or experience Christ here and now is through the Spirit, and to experience the Spirit is to be in effective relationship with Christ. In other words, the Spirit is Christ as he is active in the present in the lives of men and women: it is not an impersonal force, but a personal power drawing that character from Him whom it makes present with all His benefits. The Spirit is the ever-present power and influence of the Christ-event, the impact on men of Christ freed from the confines of past history.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Since this study was first composed, there has come into our hands the important monograph by Ingo Hermann, Kyrios und Pneuma: Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen Hauptbriefe, (Munich, 1961). The author studies 2 Cor. 3:17 and his conclusions agree with the understanding we have here suggested. "'Der Herr ist der Geist' ist also eine existentielle Aussage. Sie redet über das Verhältnis von Kyrios und Pneuma nicht in der Art einer spekulativen Wesensschau, sondern gibt eine Erfahrung wieder: für mich, auf mich hin ist der Herr das Pneuma, er stellt sich für mich als Pneuma dar. .. 'Pneuma' der Name für jene personeigene Potenz des Erhöhten ist, mit der er auf den Menschen hin wirksam wird" (50). Other phrases Hermann uses are "Christus wird erfahrbar als Pneuma" (49) and Pneuma "als dynamische Präsenz des Kyrios" (51).

This is not an entirely new understanding of the passage, although Hermann's theological application of the Kyrios-Pneuma identity is fresh and stimulating. N.Q. Hamilton, op.



This leads naturally to the consideration of the relation of the Spirit to the resurrection of Christ. Two passages are of importance in this connection. At Rom. 1:3-4 Paul makes use of what may be an early Christological formula describing the Son, "born of the seed of David κατὰ σάρκα, appointed Son of God in power κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγίουσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν". Paul is not here contrasting two evaluations of the person of Christ, a fleshly (human) judgment and a spiritual judgment. The phrases κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγίουσύνης denote two spheres of existence: in the realm denoted by "flesh" Jesus was a descendant of

cit., p.6 (on 2 Cor.3:17) says "The Spirit brings the ascended Lord to earth again. The Spirit bridges the gap between transcendence and immanence. The identity here posited is not ontological, an identity of being, but dynamic, an identity which occurs in redemptive action". E. Schweizer, op. cit., also provides a similar explanation of 2 Cor. 3:17. Hermann reviews and rejects the other principal interpretations of the passage. The hypostatic-Trinitarian view is found defective because it introduces terms and concepts which are posterior to Paul. The explanation of the identity of the Lord and the Spirit in terms of the revealing of the hidden meaning of Scripture (a view adopted by A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London, 1958, pp. 121-22) cannot be carried through in v.17b and 18. W. Schmithals (Evangelische Theologie, XVIII, 1958, pp.552f) claims that 3:17a is a Gnostic gloss: the statement is too closely integrated with and necessary to the context to make this view likely.

Hermann's monograph was discussed by B. Schneider, Biblica, XLIV, (1963) pp. 358-69. The criticisms offered there are not concerned with details of exegesis, but with the functional interpretation of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit. Schneider's desire to extract from Paul hints on the essence or nature of the Spirit are not likely to be met by honest exegesis. Paul was describing experience, not engaging in metaphysical discussion. Cf. Hamilton, op.cit., p.3; Cullmann, Christ and Time, p.26; F. Büchsel, Der Geist Gottes im NT, (Gütersloh, 1926) p.396.



David: in the sphere denoted by πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης<sup>1</sup> he was appointed<sup>2</sup> Son of God in power since (or on the ground of) the resurrection of the dead.<sup>3</sup> It is probable that ἐν δυνάμει should be construed with "Son of God": after the resurrection, Christ was appointed Son of God in power. This would not exclude his having been previously Son of God, though without the manifestation of power which took place in the Resurrection.<sup>4</sup> Consequently we may say that both before,

1 The descriptive gen. is probably of Semitic origin, and lends support to the claim that the formula is pre-Pauline.

2 The word ὁρισθέντος is sometimes rendered "defined" or "declared to be" or "manifested". This translation avoids the charge of adoptionism which can be brought against "appointed". The NT usage, however, favours "appointed" (cf. Acts 10:42, 17:31). The parallelism with γενομένου suggests that we should see in ὁρισθέντος the second phase of the career of the Son.

3 The likelihood that the formula is pre-Pauline may account for the use of ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν rather than ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, to refer to the Resurrection. S.H. Hooke, "The Translation of Romans 1:4", NTS, IX, (1963) pp. 370-1 thinks that we should translate literally "the resurrection of dead persons" now made possible by the resurrection of Christ. This (in his opinion) is what marks Christ out as Son of God, vis. his initiation of resurrection.

4 The κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης may include a reference to the earthly ministry of Christ and the power with which he was endowed: see T.W. Manson, The Beginning of the Gospel, I, (Oxford, 1950) p.110; J.E. Yates, The Spirit and the Kingdom, p. 47 and W.C. van Unnik, "Jesus the Christ", NTS, VIII, (1961-62) pp. 101-116. van Unnik makes much of the idea of the possession of the Spirit as the essential element in the early Christian understanding of the Messiahship of Jesus. Manson claims that the Romans passage refers to three stages, the human side, the spiritual, divine side of Jesus' life and ministry, and his becoming Kyrios after the Resurrection. This requires a comma after ἁγιωσύνης. It is not necessary to adopt this expedient to keep alive in "spirit of holiness" some connection with the ministry of the Lord.



but supremely in power after the resurrection, Christ is Son of God in relation to the spirit of holiness ( κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιασύνης ). This accords with our understanding of "Holy Spirit" up to this point. Divine spiritual power, with its source in God, was operative among men in the ministry: but after the Resurrection, that Spirit becomes the mode or manner of Jesus' existence as Lord: the limitations and infirmity of the flesh have given way to power in the Spirit. By the Resurrection there has been brought into being the Age of the Spirit, the age of power, in which the impact of the Christ becomes effective upon all believers. Commenting on this verse I. Hermann says:

Pneuma erscheint als die von Gott ausgehende und durch Christus hindurch wirkende göttliche Kraft, welche die lebendige Verbindung zwischen dem wirkenden Gott und dem antwortenden Menschenherzen begründet und bewahrt. 1

The most important passage connecting the Spirit and the Resurrection is 1 Cor. 15:44-45. Paul here states that the last Adam, meaning Christ, became "life-giving Spirit ( πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν )". The occasion of this "becoming" is not stated, but the context in Chapter 15 requires that it be referred to the time of the Resurrection. The resurrection of believers is grounded entirely upon the resurrection of Christ. As the first-fruits of them that sleep,

I Hermann, op.cit., p.61. Cf. Hamilton, op.cit., pp.12-13, C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans, pp. 18ff, F.J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, pp. 36ff.



Christ became equipped with Spirit, not for a temporary period, but in the same way as a man is equipped with life: it is the very essence of the post-Resurrection life. Here "Spirit" and the life of the Resurrected Lord are identified. Moreover, this life is communicable: it can make others alive, since, by the Resurrection, Christ became a "life-giving spirit". In all this we find expressed what we have been suggesting in this work concerning the relationship of the Spirit to Christ. We have attempted to understand the Spirit as the total impact of the Christ-event (life, death and resurrection) upon man in the present, a power to guide and control conduct. This power or influence means the transcending by Christ of the limits of time and place, the making present of the meaning and power of a past event. Now we find Paul clearly relating this to the Resurrection as the "event" which liberated the power of Christ's life from historical confines to be active and operative upon all who will acknowledge and obey him. The Resurrection is the occasion of the liberating of Christ to be life-giving Spirit. This, in very personal terms, means that Christ is known to be alive because he is experienced today as a power influencing our lives, and this living and abiding impact is the Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is no notion of materiality present here, no idea of a substance: what is in view is personal power originating in God. Hermann op.cit., admits that there are a few traces of Hellenistic ideas and expressions in Paul's teaching on



Having thus interpreted πνεῦμα φωτισίου, we must now seek the meaning of σῶμα πνευματικόν. In the first place, it is opposed to σῶμα ψυχικόν, life on the physical plane, which is marked by weakness, corruption and dishonour: just as σῶμα ψυχικόν emphasises the unity of all mankind in Adam's life, so σῶμα πνευματικόν stresses the unity of men in a new life, on a spiritual plane, characterised by incorruption, glory and power. Secondly, this new life is added to earthly life, by the act of God ("it is raised") not by the working out of immanent evolutionary processes. Therefore, in σῶμα πνευματικόν, the term πνεῦμα cannot be regarded as a substance in the Hellenistic sense, guaranteeing the continuance of life. For Paul, πνεῦμα is power coming directly from God through Christ: therefore a σῶμα πνευματικόν is a body of which the principle is divine Spirit, just as ψυχὴ is the natural life-principle of the earthly body. The form of existence we share with Adam (ψυχὴ ζωσα) gives way to a new mode of being, shared with the risen Christ by those who are in him, a mode of being dependent on, and defined as "Spirit", within which there is continuity of essential personality and individuality (σῶμα).<sup>1</sup>

---

πνεῦμα (1 Cor. 1-3 and Rom. 8:5) but these have little bearing on his fundamental conception, which is firmly rooted in the OT and Rabbinic tradition (ch.12).

<sup>1</sup> Paul's use of σῶμα for the solidarity of man as a whole does not exclude its reference to the reality of individuality. Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, (London, 1952) p.79 note 1.



We conclude our study of Paul's use of πνεῦμα (referring to divine Spirit) with a brief mention of the other occurrences of the adjective πνευματικός. In 1 Cor. 2:13ff. Paul states that the natural man (ψυχικός) is blind to the meaning of God's saving work, while the πνευματικός recognises it. It is clear that the term denotes the man who is illumined by the power of God's Spirit (cf. Jude 19). The things of God can only be interpreted πνευματικῶς (v.15), i.e. under the guidance of the Spirit. It follows that πνευματικά are "truths given by, or relating to, the Spirit of God", namely, the Gospel (1 Cor. 2:13): these can be contrasted with σαρκικά, things concerned with natural life (1 Cor. 9:11). The description of food and drink as πνευματικόν (1 Cor. 10:3) connotes their divine origin and ability to communicate divine power. The foods are not "bearers of the Spirit": that interpretation is excluded by the presence of πνευματικὴ πέτρα at 4b: the meaning is "of supernatural or divine origin". At 1 Cor. 14:1 πνευματικά connotes the totality of spiritual gifts, while at Rom. 7:14 the law (ὁ νόμος) is described as πνευματικός, in order to make clear that it is a law which was given by God, possessing divine authority, not just the authority of man. At Eph. 6:12 τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας are "spiritual powers of evil" (cf. Eph. 2:2).



In attempting to summarise our study of Paul to this point, we may begin by saying that Paul broke the exclusive association of the Spirit with the abnormal. It is not an agent of division or of showy individualism. Although there are many manifestations of its power and presence, the Spirit should be the source of unity in the Church, and all the gifts of the Spirit should be judged in terms of their ability to build up the Community. The endowment with the Spirit (in baptism) marks the commencement of Christian living. All along the pathway of Christian life, the Spirit is the source of moral virtue: it is radically ethical and the highest manifestation of its presence is *ἀγαπή*. In view of the unfulfilled and incomplete nature of life in this realm, the presence of the Spirit and the forward-looking awareness which it brings and inspires are regarded as the pledge of a fuller possession and salvation in the future. For Paul, the Spirit does not have independent personality: it is spoken of in personal terms, because it is God's power in action, the means whereby God in Christ is operative in the life of the Church and in the hearts of individuals. The relation between the Spirit and Christ is described as an identity in terms of function: the power of the Spirit is the controlling, guiding impact on the lives of men of Christ, freed, by the resurrection, from the confines of past history, to become an ever-present reality.



Paul employs the word πνεῦμα to denote "human spirit" much less frequently than to denote "divine spirit". When it appears with this sense, it bears (as in other NT writings) a psychological connotation and refers to the seat of the will and of emotions, and to the disposition or general attitude of a person. This use is in accord with the OT and Jewish use of נפש / πνεῦμα as a psychological term.

At 2 Cor. 2:13 Paul claims that at Troas he had no relief and rest ( ἄνεσις ) in his spirit ( τῷ πνεύματί μου ) because he had not found Titus: here πνεῦμα connotes the seat of feeling and emotion, with some hint of the involvement of the will. What the Apostle means is not just that he had no physical rest (2 Cor. 7:5), but that he experienced mental and emotional strain. Likewise, at 2 Cor. 7:13, the "spirit" of Titus was refreshed, just as Paul was restored, by the Corinthians' change of heart and attitude. Again πνεῦμα refers to the inward depths of a man where emotions of anxiety, joy and encouragement are felt (cf. Philem. 7,20). In the opening section of Romans (1:9) Paul declares that he "serves God ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου in the Gospel of his Son". Schweizer claims that here πνεῦμα is "the Spirit of God which is made available to the Apostle personally",<sup>1</sup> but it seems that what Paul means is that his service to God in the Gospel has become the dominating impulse in his life: it

<sup>1</sup> Schweizer, op.cit., p.85.



is no partial involvement: the service of the Gospel has taken hold of him at the very core of his being. When the Apostle encourages the Philippian Christians to "stand fast in one spirit" (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, 1:27), he means, not unity in the Holy Spirit, but unity of will and purpose, parallel to *μία ψυχὴ*. The same meaning - namely "disposition or attitude" - belongs to *πνεῦμα* at 2 Cor. 12:18 and perhaps at Eph. 4:23.<sup>1</sup>

In Paul's final salutation at Gal. 6:18, Phil. 4:23 and Philemon 25 - "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit (*μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν*)" - *πνεῦμα* means the same as "you" (cf. 1 Thess. 5:28). The phrase may have a liturgical origin: it reflects also the OT and Jewish use of *אני* as the equivalent of "a person's self". The psychological term denotes the whole person. At 1 Cor. 2:11 *πνεῦμα* connotes "human consciousness", the organ of self-knowledge: as Bultmann says, "pneuma approaches the modern idea of consciousness".<sup>2</sup> A similar use is evidenced at Rom 8:16, "The Spirit of God beareth witness to, or with, our spirit (*τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν*) that we are the children of God": the human *πνεῦμα* is considered as that part of man which receives spiritual knowledge. The greeting at 1 Thess. 5:23 suggests that Paul accepted the popular tripartite psychology: "May <sup>1</sup> For the contrary view, see C. Masson, *op.cit.*, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, p.207.



your whole spirit ( πνεῦμα ), soul ( ψυχὴ ) and body ( σῶμα ) be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ". The combination may be fortuitous (since Paul's use of these terms is rather fluid), and, in any case, the salutation may well be a traditional liturgical expression<sup>1</sup> telling us really nothing about Pauline anthropology. Paul wishes to stress the completeness of the preservation desired, and draws upon a traditional means of expressing the totality of a person. The idea of the entirety of a person is conveyed at 1 Cor. 7:34 by ἀγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, where, perhaps, πνεῦμα suggests the inward aspect of a person, and σῶμα the outward.

At Col. 2:5 and 1 Cor. 5:3 we find "absence in the body" contrasted with "presence in the spirit" ( παρὼν τῷ πνεύματι, τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι ). Here πνεῦμα seems to suggest "mind" or "wish and will". Paul's thoughts are with the situation, though he is not physically present: his "mind" on the question is known to his correspondents, and his sympathies and interest will support them in their decision. It is possible that there are overtones of meaning in the use of πνεῦμα here: there may be included the idea of presence in the power of the Holy Spirit. The spirit or mind of Paul is formed and dominated by the active influence of

<sup>1</sup> Bultmann, op.cit., pp. 205-6, "The formulation is to be explained as coming from liturgical-rhetorical (perhaps traditional) diction".



the Spirit, and so he brings to bear on the situation the mind or attitude of Christ (note v.4, "I judge... in the name of the Lord Jesus"). At v.5 of 1 Cor.5, σάρξ and πνεῦμα are contrasted, the first requiring destruction, the second salvation. Here πνεῦμα refers to the real self, the real person, perhaps even the spirit of the Corinthian member in so far as it has already been regenerated by the Spirit of God and contains in germ the body of the resurrection in the inner man.<sup>1</sup>

Once in Eph. 2:2, πνεῦμα is used of "evil spirit", a use found frequently in the Synoptics, "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit ( πνεῦμα ) that worketh in the children of disobedience" (cf. Rom. 11:8). A somewhat similar suggestion is implied in the words τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου (1 Cor. 2:12) "the spirit of the world" which has not been received by the Christian: he has received "the Spirit which is of God" ( τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ). It would seem that the idea expressed is of the temper of the world, the "spirit" of human life alienated from God, in which case, πνεῦμα is almost impersonal and the phrase is practically identical with ἀνθρωπίνῃ σοφίᾳ at v.13 (cf. 2 Cor. 11:4).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Héring, La Première Épître de St. Paul aux Corinthiens, p. 40. This work (in its second French edition) has been translated into English by A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, (Epworth Press, 1962.)



Part 4. The Gospel of John.

When we turn to the Fourth Gospel we find that the use of the word πνεῦμα to denote a "spirit" of uncleanness and disease is totally absent. The accounts of exorcisms, so characteristic of the Synoptics, are wanting in John. We discover the word used once to denote "wind": 3:8 τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει. Since the author immediately passes to the use of the word πνεῦμα to denote the agent of regeneration, it seems likely that he had in mind the Hebrew use of רוּחַ to refer to "wind" (the example of mysterious, superhuman power) and to "the Spirit of God". In the phrase describing the death of Jesus, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα (19:30) it is probable that πνεῦμα means the "human spirit" or "vital principle" which leaves a man at death.<sup>1</sup> Twice in the Gospel (11:33, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι and 13:21, ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι) the word is used in the psychological sense, the origins and use of which are already familiar. That the phrase refers to disturbance of the human spirit of Jesus (the seat of emotion), and not to a spasm brought on by the Spirit, is clear from the former of the two passages where τῷ πνεύματι is synonymous with ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

<sup>1</sup> The phrase could be interpreted as "He bequeathed the Spirit (to the world)": this is a common connotation of παραδοῦναι. Probably John is intentionally suggesting both, since, in his view, it was precisely at this moment - the moment of glorification in death - that the gift of the Spirit became possible.



From our study of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts we found that the basic outline of Christian belief and teaching about the Spirit was as follows: John the Baptist had predicted a baptism ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ : Jesus was anointed to his Messianic ministry by the Holy Spirit; he promised the aid of the Holy Spirit to his disciples in times of need: the post-Resurrection promise of the endowment with the Spirit (Acts 1) was fulfilled in the experience of the Church. In his Gospel John has reproduced these basic articles of Christian teaching.

(i) Chapter 1:32-3 records the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, the sign that he was the one who baptises ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ .<sup>1</sup> Jesus has the Spirit that he may confer it on others. Two points of interest may be observed here. Only when John is in immediate contact with the articles of the tradition, as here and at 20:22, does he use the common early Christian term πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Secondly, in the Synoptics, the endowment with the Spirit in baptism (together with, in Matthew and Luke, the conception by the Holy Spirit) means the inauguration of the Messiahship, interpreted in terms of Sonship and Servanthood; so too in John, the descent of the Spirit is a confirmation of the Messianic status.

(ii) John 3:34: ὁ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα . Since  
1 For the meaning of this phrase, see above pp. 469-74.



it is probably correct to assume that the subject of the verb is "God", the statement refers to the completeness of the gift of the Spirit (the prophetic Spirit) by reason of which Jesus speaks the words of God.

(iii) 7:39: οὕτω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὕτω ἐδοξάσθη. This parenthetical statement does not mean that John denied the earlier existence of the Spirit and its activity (cf. 1:32): it means rather that "the Holy Spirit was not given in the characteristically Christian manner and measure till the close of the ministry".<sup>1</sup> The gift of the Spirit, in John's view, depended on the completion of Jesus' work in the glorious denouement of the Cross.

(iv) John 14:16-17 and other passages record the promise of the Paraclete, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, to strengthen, guide and illumine believers.

(v) After his resurrection Jesus appeared to the eleven disciples and breathed upon them (ἐνεφύσησεν) and said Ἄβετε πνεῦμα ἁγίον. This Johannine "Pentecost" (20:22) has no tongues of fire, no rushing mighty wind. Just as God breathed into Adam (ἐνεφύσησεν LXX Gen. 2:7) the breath of life and he became a living being, so the Risen, glorified Lord breathes his spirit upon the disciples and they become the "new Creation". The character and evidence of the bestowal is not inspired utterance, but the endowment with

<sup>1</sup> C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, p.272.



authority for the continuation of the ministry of Christ. "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained". As in Acts, the gift of the Spirit here signifies power and authority to declare the gospel of redemption. The parallel with the Acts tradition is strengthened if we regard the Eleven disciples as representatives of believers in general.<sup>1</sup> To all members of the Church is given the gift of the Spirit by which the ministry of its Lord is perpetuated.<sup>2</sup>

The author of the Fourth Gospel then has reproduced the framework of early Christian belief concerning the Spirit. The main points of the Synoptic and Acts tradition are retained, sometimes with their language (1:33 and 20:22). For John, Jesus is endowed with the Spirit in his ministry: to a greater degree than in the Synoptics Jesus is represented as the bestower of the Spirit, but the gift to men is integrated into John's general futuristic scheme: it is only in the future, after the death and resurrection, that the Spirit will be given. Indeed, except for the passages in which the Spirit is spoken of as resting on Jesus, all

<sup>1</sup> Schweizer, op.cit., p.95 and R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church (London, 1938) pp. 242f. For the view which sees the Eleven as recipients of the Spirit by virtue of a special office, see J.H. Bernard, St. John, (ICC, Edinburgh, 1928) pp. 672, 676, and The Apostolic Ministry, ed. K.E. Kirk, (London, 1946) pp. 108-9.

<sup>2</sup> "The authority implied conveys an extension of the ministry of Jesus through that of the Holy Spirit", C.K. Barrett, op.cit., p.475.



the Johannine statements about it relate to the period after Jesus' death. This is demonstrated by the use of the simple future tenses (as in ch. 14-16) or by their being associated with aspects of later Church life - baptism in ch. 3, worship in ch. 4 and the Eucharist in 6:63.

In 4:23ff. we have a general reference to worship "in the Spirit". "Those who worship the Father must worship him ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ". This phrase is frequently interpreted as counselling sincerity and depth in worship, the avoidance of externalism and ritual, but many recent commentators consider that the meaning is more far-reaching. For one thing, the association of πνεῦμα καὶ ἀληθεία recalls that one of the characteristic Johannine titles of the Holy Spirit is τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. Secondly, the single ἐν suggests that πνεῦμα καὶ ἀληθεία are considered as one entity. Thirdly, the meaning of the phrase ἐν πνεύματι must depend on the force of πνεῦμα in the next verse: πνεῦμα ὁ θεός. To translate this phrase as "God is a spirit" (AV) suggests that God is one of a class of "spirits" (πνεύματα) and that use of πνεῦμα is not found anywhere in John. Verbally, the phrase might seem to echo the Stoic definition of God as πνεῦμα διήκον δι' ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, a very tenuous form of air suffused through the whole universe and appearing in living beings as the soul. The materialism of this definition was never completely transcended even by the writers



who tried to maintain, by using πνεῦμα , a non-material Platonic conception of deity. It is difficult to imagine that John is giving support to some form of semi-materialistic idea of God, especially when we recall that his regular use of πνεῦμα is grounded firmly in Hebraic thinking. Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός , like the expressions, "God is light" and "God is love", is not a definition of the being of God, but an attempt to describe the nature of his relation to the world and his activity within it. "Spirit" is to be understood here, as in the OT, of the personal power of the Divine manifested purposefully in the world and in the lives of men. When John says that God is πνεῦμα , he is asserting his nature as creative life-giving power in relation to his people. Now that creative, life-giving activity was revealed supremely in Christ. Therefore "worship ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ " is worship that takes place in and through Christ (cf. 2:19-22) because Christ is, at one and the same time, "life-giving power" and "truth". Indeed the phrase ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ means the same as Paul's ἐν Χριστῷ .<sup>1</sup> Not on Gerizim, nor in Zion, but in Christ, the manifestation of truth and power, is the place and sphere of true worship.

In John's Gospel the Spirit is closely connected with the Sacraments. The statement, "Unless a man is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, (2 Abt. 16 Auf. Göttingen, 1959) p. 140 note 3.



born of water and spirit (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ) he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (3:5) is a definition of Christian regeneration, equivalent to "the begetting ὡς θεῶν". It is baptismal regeneration through the Spirit. The importance of "spirit" in John's teaching here is demonstrated by its repetition at v.6 and v.8ff.: it was the addition of "spirit" which transformed John the Baptist's baptism into Christian baptism (Acts 19:1-7). In discussing the Matthean and Lucan stories about the miraculous conception ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου , we suggested that the Spirit should be understood as the creating power and activity of God inaugurating the New Creation in the birth of the Messianic redeemer. Is there not a parallel theme in John's doctrine of regeneration? The Spirit is brought into relation to re-birth or birth from above: it is the originator, or begetter, not of physical life, but of new life (v.6). The Spirit is the life-giving power which makes men and women anew. "Birth from above, or from the Spirit" hardly differs in substance from Paul's conception of "new Creation". By understanding John's reference to the Spirit in baptism as implying something more than an endowment or confement, we do justice to the emphasis which John lays upon it in this chapter, and we give a greater unity to the whole passage. The Spirit brings about the New Creation: it creates the new life: baptism is the symbol and the occasion of the event.



The life-creating power of the Spirit is again emphasised at 6:63, a verse which explains the discourse on the Bread of life: "What then, if you should behold the Son of Man ascending where he was before? τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν. ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν· τὰ ῥήματα αὖ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωὴ ἐστίν." "All of Jesus' teaching about the Bread of Life must be viewed in the light of two facts which John can introduce from his own later standpoint: they are the Ascension and the work of the Spirit which the Ascension makes possible (cf. 7:39). Life, which is for John the content of salvation, is conveyed, not by "flesh", but by "spirit": τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν. Since the discourse was composed with reference to the Eucharist, it seems likely that John intends to imply a connection between that rite and the Spirit. The sacramental meal, if it is to give life, must be a vehicle of the Spirit, and such indeed it is, not in itself, but in its witness to the historic act of revelation and redemption in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> But the Eucharist is not the only life-giving agency. The words of Jesus are "spirit and life". If the standpoint of John is correctly taken to be that of the age of the Church, ῥήματα need not refer exclusively to the preceding discourse: all

<sup>1</sup> In a context concerned with the Eucharist, ἡ σὰρξ may have a reference to the symbols or elements of the Sacrament. The material symbols of Jesus' body and blood in themselves do not convey life: they have value and significance solely as vehicles of the life-giving Spirit.



the teaching of the Incarnate Christ is productive of life, because it is "Spirit". Just as the sacramental rite brings out of the past into the present the redeeming act of Christ, so knowledge of his words keeps alive and effectual the historical teaching: in doing so, Sacrament and Scripture convey life by bringing men into vital touch with the historic Christ.<sup>1</sup> If this is what is implied in John's doctrine, then his characteristic understanding of the Spirit is close to what we discovered in Paul. Moreover, the fact that, for John, the activity of the Spirit could only follow the glorification of Christ in resurrection and ascension is parallel to Paul's teaching on the Spirit as the post-Resurrection power of Christ's life.

At 7:38ff. the Holy Spirit is likened to "living water" (ὕδωρ ζῶν). There is difficulty in the punctuation of these verses, but in order to retain the parallelism and in view of the context, it seems best to interpret thus:

He that thirsts, let him come; he that believeth on me, let him drink: as the Scripture says, "Out of the midst of Him (i.e. out of the midst of me, the Christ) shall flow rivers of living water". This he said about the Spirit which those who believed on him were to receive, for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.

2

When considered in this way, the passage is consistent in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 342 note 3.

<sup>2</sup> On this verse, see above pp. 382-4.



its declaration: living water, the gift which creates and maintains life, comes from Christ: the living water is the Spirit: the Spirit comes from the glorified Christ. Now "living water" is used in the OT as a metaphor for the divine activity in quickening men to life (Jer. 2:13, Zech. 14:8, Ezek. 47:9) and appears in Judaism as a symbol for the Holy Spirit. So John declares that that which quickens men to life is the Spirit (cf. 6:63), the power and presence of the exalted Christ active in the hearts of believers to create and sustain new life.

The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας occurs three times in John: 14:17, the Paraclete (ὁ παράκλητος) is the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, but who dwells with the disciples and will be in them; 15:26, the Paraclete is the Spirit of truth who proceeds from God and who will bear witness (as the disciples do also) to Jesus; 16:13, "The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth: he will not speak on his own authority (ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ), but whatsoever he will hear he will speak and he will declare the things that are to come. He will glorify me: he will take what is mine and declare it to you". (Cf. 14:26, the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, will teach the disciples all things and bring to their remembrance all that Jesus said.) From these verses it is clear that παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας are synonymous



expressions. The coming of the Spirit or Paraclete depends on the completion of Christ's work and his departure from earth (16:7): it proceeds from the Father in the name of Christ, i.e. to act in relation to Christ, in Christ's place and with his authority: it brings no independent revelation, but teaches concerning the revelation in Christ: it declares to the world the truth of the mission and being of Christ (16:14): it operates on the consciences of men to convict of sin (in themselves), righteousness (in Christ) and of judgment (16:8ff.):<sup>1</sup> it is not received by the world, but dwells with and in the disciples, therefore presumably is experienced in and mediated through the Church.

Bearing in mind this summary of the functions of the Spirit, we proceed to the discussion of the meaning of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. It is doubtful if τῆς ἀληθείας is simply a defining genitive (equivalent to ἀληθινῇ). Already in the chapter (v.6) Jesus is declared to be "the truth" (ἡ ἀλήθεια) so that the expression may mean "the Spirit of the Truth, i.e. Jesus". Barrett prefers to explain it as "the Spirit who communicates truth",<sup>2</sup> but even there "truth" must refer to Christ himself and to the revelation in him. It seems best to understand the phrase as "the Spirit which mediates the truth as it is in Jesus". The fact that its activity is to witness to Jesus and to convict of sin etc.

<sup>1</sup> Barrett, op.cit., pp. 406-8.

<sup>2</sup> Op.cit., p. 386.



suggests that the Johannine understanding of the function of the Spirit is essentially the same as the Pauline: the Spirit is the powerful impact of the person, work and teaching of Jesus upon the hearts and lives of believers in every generation.<sup>1</sup> The exaltation of Christ and his resurrected life means his living presence with, and transforming power in, all who believe: to experience this power and presence is to experience the Spirit.

If this is a true understanding of the function of the Spirit, the word παράκλητος may mean "advocate" or "vindicator": the Spirit, as the continuing power of Christ's life, vindicates the character of his historical existence. Barrett thinks that παράκλητος is the Spirit of the Christian paraclesis, the Spirit who is operative in the Christian proclamation of the redemption effected by Jesus.<sup>2</sup> That this aspect of meaning is present also is quite possible: the influence of Christ's life in the present (the Spirit) is certainly related to the proclamation of the kerygma in the Church.

<sup>1</sup> In our discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we interpreted the Spirit of truth in the Manual (which is parallel to the "holy spirit" in 1QH) in terms of a power or force, with perhaps some cosmic dimension, which is inwardly experienced and brings about right conduct. At Test. Jud. 20 "the Spirit of truth" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) has the same functions as the Johannine Paraclete, but in John the actions are governed by their reference to Christ. In Test. Jud. the spirit is equivalent to the good inclination, the inward disposition towards righteousness.

<sup>2</sup> Op.cit., p.385-86, and JTS (n.s.), I, (1950) pp. 1-15 and especially pp. 7ff.



In all this, let it be observed, we are in touch with the central Hebraic idea of the Spirit of God as power and activity entering into the world to recreate and inspire men. The power is the power of God's revelation in Christ and therefore personal.

John's characteristic teaching on the Spirit, then, relates its activity to the life of the Church and particularly to Christian worship. In baptism the power of the Spirit in recreating life is symbolised: both the Eucharist and Scripture are vehicles of the life-giving Spirit. The activity of the Spirit is the making present to the lives of men of the power and influence of the historical life of Jesus, the bridging of the gap between the events in Galilee and Jerusalem nearly two thousand years ago and the life of believers in every new generation. The power of the Spirit is the present power of the living Lord.



CONCLUSION

The Findings of the Word - Studies

564

The Word - Studies in relation to the issues  
raised by Professor Barr

574/6



# CONCLUSION

The purpose of this final chapter is two-fold: to present briefly the findings of the individual word-studies, and to relate these conclusions and, by implication, the principles of investigation by which they have been reached, to the main issues raised for Biblical Theology by Professor Barr's recent work.

We begin with the findings of the five studies.

1. The ἱλάσκεσθαι word-group, and especially ἱλαστήριον .

Our examination of the contexts in which 793 and its regular translation ἐξιλάσκεσθαι etc. appear revealed that they almost always expressed or implied the holy wrath of Yahweh against sin. This suggests that the idea of propitiation lingers to some extent in the words, as part of the vocabulary of sacrifice. The action which expiated sin was propitiatory in its total effect in that it conciliated the divine hostility and opened the way to the restoration of the divine favour. When considered in its own right, the Greek of the LXX suggests that occasionally the idea of propitiating divine wrath was kept alive by the use of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι where another word could have been expected. Moreover, Ps. 106:30 and probably also Num. 25:13 use the Greek word in a clearly propitiatory sense, as do Zech. 7:2, 8:22, Mal. 1:9 (pace Dodd). In discussing 793 as the common Hebrew background of our word-group,



Dodd's distinction between a religious and a non-religious use was found inadequate and was replaced by a distinction between the earlier non-cultic use, in which the idea of propitiation is clearly present, and the (probably) later cultic application, in which the term has become conventionalised and should be interpreted broadly in terms of atonement (as at Qumran) which includes both the idea of expiating sin and appeasing or conciliating the divine wrath which prevented communion. We cannot say that all ideas of propitiation are absent from the LXX use of ἱλάσ-κεσθαι and, in our opinion, they are present in the NT usage, wherever the "wrath of God" is implied or expressed in the context. It is expressed in Romans 3 and therefore the conciliation of that hostile attitude to sin lies within the total purpose of the sacrifice for sin in the atoning death of Christ. This aspect of atoning sacrifice we brought into association with the old Jewish martyr theology, and especially with 4 Maccabees 17 (in which the words ἱλαστήριος θανάτος appear) where the suffering and propitiatory death of righteous men purified and atoned for the sins of a nation.

2. The λύτρον word-group.

In LXX Greek the λύτρον words regularly render the Hebrew roots בַּחַל and נָתַן, and their derived forms. The words formed from these two roots were used in the Law codes



of the Old Testament for the process of ransoming by payment of a price, but were also technical terms for the action of Yahweh in delivering Israel and individual saints, where there is no clear conception of a ransom-price paid for freedom. It seems likely that the connotation "emancipation" (without precise definition of the way in which it was brought about) attached itself to the words λυτρόω etc. through their association in Biblical Greek with Hebrew meanings and thought. The classical Greek use of the terms always denotes ransoming by the payment of price, and the price is almost invariably stated.

It would appear that it is only if we interpret the λύτρον -words in the NT in terms of classical Greek usage alone that we shall insist on the presence of the idea of ransoming by payment of a price. Biblical Greek usage suggests that their interpretation should be in terms of "emancipation", except when the context expresses or implies a payment made to gain freedom (cf. 1 Pet. 1:18). By applying the λύτρον -words to the death of Christ, the NT authors emphasise the idea of freedom and deliverance (after the pattern of the great deliverances of Israel) and of restoration to rightful ownership which had been brought about by Christ. They do not set forth in the word-group a particular theory concerning the process by which this emancipation was achieved. A possible exception to this may be



Mark 10:45, but the surrounding complex of words suggests that λύτρον should be interpreted in terms of the idea of substitutionary sacrifice and the Jewish theme of atonement by the death of the righteous. The use of ἀπολύτρωσις in eschatological contexts retains no suggestion of "ransoming by payment": the meaning is "deliverance" into the full enjoyment of the divine fellowship.

### 3. The δίκαιος group of words.

Behind these words stands the Hebrew root  $\text{רצח}$  whose original significance was associated with the notion of conformity to a norm which required to be defined in each case. Biblical Hebrew gave to the root a characteristic content by drawing it into the Covenant theme. The "righteousness of Yahweh" meant his being "in the right" by reason of his faithfulness to the Covenant relationship, a faithfulness which resulted in victory for Israel over her enemies, and which was so constant, even to those who did not deserve it, that "righteousness" for Deutero-Isaiah became almost synonymous with "salvation". Community and personal  $\text{רצח}$  connoted "in the right-ness" with regard to the Covenant and therefore obedience to the obligations and laws of the Covenant which provided the basis for the right ordering of the nation's life, both in its manward and Godward aspects. Throughout the Old Testament the word "righteousness" is essentially a legal or relational term.



Although the verb δικάιῶ in classical Greek is not used in any sense corresponding to פָּרַח in Hebrew, the adjective δίκαιος and the noun δικαιοσύνη were associated with the idea of conformity to a standard; but, in contrast to the Old Testament view, the norm was not a divine demand within a special relationship, but the mutual obligations of men in human society, a reasonable fairness or justice within the social group. Moreover, in Greek thought there was nothing lastingly comparable to the Hebrew idea of the "righteousness of God", and no development towards the meanings "victory" and "salvation". Through being consistently used in Biblical Greek to render the Hebrew root פָּרַח the δίκαιος words underwent considerable expansion and change of meaning. The meanings of the adjective and noun became associated with "conformity to divine requirement", rather than with "justice" and "citizen-duties". The meaning of the verb δικάιῶ in Biblical Greek is governed by the Hebrew root which lies behind it. The forensic reference is almost always present: the active of δικάιῶ represents the Hiph'il פָּרַח "to cause or declare to be in the right"; and the middle and passive correspond to the Qal פָּרַח, "to be in the right".<sup>1</sup> The Dead Sea Scrolls reveal the continuation

<sup>1</sup> The verb is used in the Psalms of Solomon with the meaning "to recognise as just or righteous", i.e. man's recognition of God's righteousness in judgment. This usage is present occasionally in the Gospels, Matt. 11:19 and possibly Luke 7:29.



of the OT usage, but, in addition, they witness to the sect's profound trust in God for righteousness,<sup>1</sup> an attitude which contrasts radically with the legalistic ponderings of the Rabbis concerning merit (  $\text{מִצְוָה}$  ) as the means of achieving salvation.

It is against this Judaistic understanding of "righteousness" that Paul makes his protest. He stands within the Biblical tradition and builds upon the OT understanding of "righteousness" as a forensic notion, a term of relationship. The basis on which a man will be declared "in the right" by God is not his works in obedience to the law, but solely his faith in Christ. This means a total identification with and surrender to Christ in his death and resurrection. The man who is thus found "in Him" is "in the right", since Christ himself was the supremely righteous One. The verdict does not depend on the final judgment, but will be consummated at the End. The "righteousness of God" is manifested in Christ and connotes primarily God's action (in faithfulness to the Covenant) in establishing righteousness by declaring "righteous" those who have faith in Christ.<sup>2</sup> Paul uses  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$  to describe the character of

<sup>1</sup> The all-important difference between this piety and Paul's doctrine lies in the latter's Christocentric understanding of faith.

<sup>2</sup> Paul uses OT scripture (Gen. 15:6 and Hab. 2:4) to validate his doctrine in the eyes of Jews; but his doctrine dictates the meaning he assigns to the "righteousness" words there. The semantic change provides an index to theological development.



the Christian life, but he does not rest content with the classical Greek idea of this "righteousness" as social virtue and upright citizenship: these are included among the directly ethical aspects of the total obedience to the will of God and the law of Christ.

In the Synoptic Gospels, the δίκαιος words are consistently used with an essentially OT-Hebraic meaning. The forensic reference is present and the basic idea of "righteousness" as true obedience to the will of God expressed in the Law and embodied and established in Christ is in agreement with the fundamental tenets of OT faith (cf. Deut. 6:25). At Luke 18:14 it seems likely that the verb δικάζω is used in the sense of "to be justified" by faith in God, by confession and the plea for mercy.<sup>1</sup> At a few points in our discussion of the Gospels we suggested that the adjective δίκαιος may (in the early Church) have become a technical term to describe the Christian teacher.

#### 4. The term ζωὴ αἰώνιος .

Our investigation of the background of ζωὴ led us to the OT term חַיָּה . This word denotes physical life which according to Hebrew thought, was a gift derived from God. Life in its fulness lies in obedience to God's will. Where OT teaching provides hints of a life beyond death, it con-

<sup>1</sup> This is again an anticipation of the Pauline teaching, but (like Qumran and the Psalms) it lacks Paul's essential Christ-reference.



ceives of that life as being rooted in the experience of unbreakable fellowship with God, or as dependent on the might of his resurrecting power. The pregnant sense of ζῆν with the meaning "to really live", "to live in the fullest sense" is found occasionally in late Greek authors. The only occurrence of ζῆν αἰώνιος in the LXX is Dan. 12:2, where it renders the Hebrew חַיִּים עֲלָמִים and suggests "life of indefinite duration" in the gift of God. The idea of eschatological life is carried forward in the Inter-testamental literature, notably in the Psalms of Solomon, the books of Maccabees and in the Ethiopian Enoch.<sup>1</sup> In the Dead Sea Scrolls the common uses of the word חַיִּים reappear: both the texts and the layout of the graves suggest that the Qumran sect believed in a doctrine of immortality.

The content of the term ζῆν αἰώνιος in the NT is indebted to the Jewish idea of the "life of the Age to come" (חַיִּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא) which could bear a temporal as well as a qualitative reference. In the letters of Paul ζῆν and ζῆν αἰώνιος are used of the Christian life which is both presently possessed and the object of future hope. At Mark 9:43-47 ζῆν is equivalent to the "kingdom of God" which is present, but still to be consummated. In choosing the term "eternal life" to describe the content of salvation, John

<sup>1</sup> In Eth. Enoch there are a few pre-Christian passages which attest the belief that righteous men will live eternally in a "Paradise" situated "in the north".



is in touch with the Jewish-Synoptic-Pauline tradition. His emphasis on the present-ness of the Life of the Age to come in the experience of the believer is explicable with reference to the vertical (rather than horizontal) dualism with which he works: the life of the realm above (i.e. real life) overlaps and penetrates this world. It is essentially the life of Christ mediated to those who, in obedience and faith, submit to his judgment on their lives and are thereby renewed and revived. This eternal life is maintained also by the Sacraments which are the vehicle of the life-giving Spirit to bring men into communion with Christ.

5. The term  $\piνεῦμα$  .

Behind this term lies the Hebrew word  $\רוּחַ$ , the original significance of which (like that of  $\piνεῦμα$  itself) appears to have been "wind" or "breath". Examples of this meaning are found in all the literature investigated. When considered as an element in human nature,  $\רוּחַ$  refers to actuating emotion or dominant disposition: it reveals itself in animation or agitation. The most important use of  $\רוּחַ$  is in the supernatural sense, the  $\רוּחַ$  of Yahweh. This is the power through which God acts in the world, purposefully and creatively:<sup>1</sup> it also describes the active and inspiring presence of God to men and events. The Holy

<sup>1</sup> The use of  $\רוּחַ$   $\רוּחַ$  is infrequent in connection with the Creation in the OT and Rabbinic sources. Both, however, speak of the  $\רוּחַ$   $\רוּחַ$  as acting powerfully in re-creation in the New Age.



Spirit (lit. "the spirit of His holiness") in Is. 63 refers to the prophetic witness, the organ of God's revelation, within the community. In Ps. 51 the "spirit of God's holiness" denotes the individual's inner awareness of the Divine demand (moral consciousness) and also, in a positive sense, the power which inspires to obedience in holy and righteous living. The classical Greek usage of πνεῦμα reveals nothing comparable to the Hebrew use of רוּחַ for the "human spirit" and for the powerful, active presence of God: πνεῦμα is essentially a substance, fluidum, refined and ethereal, penetrating the entire cosmos (the Stoic anima mundi), the substance of which God and the human soul are composed. Nevertheless, the LXX renders רוּחַ by πνεῦμα consistently when it is used of Yahweh, and even occasionally when it appears with the "psychical" sense. By so doing, the LXX clearly extends the application and connotation of the Greek term. The Inter-testamental literature adds to the Biblical uses of the term a use of πνεῦμα for "personal spirits" (predominantly evil ones) and for a "human spirit" after death (in the book of Enoch). Rabbinical Judaism related the Holy Spirit almost exclusively to prophecy and the composition of Scripture. Though tending to relegate the activity of the Spirit to the past, Judaism also carried forward the OT hope for the outpouring of the Spirit in the future age, and upon the Messiah (cf. Ps. Sol. and



perhaps Test. XII Patriarchs). The very close association which exists in Rabbinic thought between the Holy Spirit and the Shekinah testifies to the conception of the Spirit as the active presence of God with his people. The word

רוח appears in all the traditional Hebrew senses in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The "two spirits" (of truth and of error) are the constant currents of good and evil influences which compete for domination over man. In the Scrolls the eschatological significance of the Spirit is not emphasised; a connection is not explicitly made between the Messiah and the Spirit, and there is no awareness of any essential tension between life under the law and life governed by the spirit.

There can be no doubt that the NT teaching concerning the Spirit stands, in all its essentials, in the main stream of the Old Testament and of Judaism. While the idea of the new, creative activity of the Spirit, inaugurating a new age, underlies the Lukan and Matthean birth narratives, the Synoptic understanding of the Spirit is primarily as the special equipment given to chosen individuals (the Messiah, or disciple witnesses) for the carrying out of an appointed mission (Messianic ministry or its continuation). The book of Acts continues this view: the Spirit is considered as the power for missionary service: it is, in fact, the controlling power of the whole missionary movement.



Although Paul uses the word  $\piνεῦμα$  to denote "disposition", "human spirit" etc. the predominance of the reference in his work is to the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. The Synoptic-Acts tradition is continued in Paul's teaching concerning the equipment of each member of the Church by the Spirit with various gifts to fulfil his appointed task. This is but one witness to the supreme Pauline conviction that the promised Age of the Spirit has already been inaugurated. The power, the gifts and the fruit of the Spirit are now experienced in the life of the believer, but they are not present in fulness: the completion of the Spirit's work belongs to the future; but the reality of that future is guaranteed by the reality of the present activity of the Spirit. The meaning of "Spirit" here is essentially the same as the Spirit previously at work in the OT, but Paul does not stress the continuity. He is concerned to emphasise the "newness" of the gift, and he does so by relating it to the person of Christ. The "Spirit" is still the active presence and power of God, but that presence and power are specifically related to, indeed identified with, the experience of the risen Christ. The function of the Spirit is to make powerful and present to personal experience the events of Christ's life, death and new life. In the Resurrection Christ has become life-giving Spirit: "the Spirit" is the very mode or manner of his



Greek of the New Testament, and neither these words nor the surveys of their background and usage in Hebrew and extra-Biblical material provide evidence from which we may argue to general modes of thinking: at most they reveal a difference in ways of understanding and expressing particular themes, and they disclose the essentially "theological" character of Biblical thought. Thus, we do not deny that the relation between language and thought may be illumined at the level of semantic studies, but we consider it dangerous to generalise from insufficient data. It is also possible that the difference between Hebrew and Greek thought may be reflected in the vocabulary stocks of the two languages,<sup>1</sup> but the attempt to base the contrast on grammatical, morphological and syntactical differences must remain a very precarious undertaking,<sup>2</sup> especially when these differences are interpreted without proper consideration of general linguistic theory and without systematic study of the relevant languages in their entirety.

Next, we consider again the charges which Professor Barr brings against the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament. It is Barr's opinion that this work not only

<sup>1</sup> Barr's renunciation of all psychological and sociological aspects in the science of language would require him to deny even this.

<sup>2</sup> For a cautious acceptance of the view, see M. Hadas, Hellenistic Culture (New York and Oxford University Press, 1959), Chap. V, "Language and Ethos", especially pp. 51-52.



life in the here and now. The total Christ-event, lifted from the past, and made effective upon man to-day is the power of the living Spirit. To "walk in the Spirit" is to live with the total meaning of the Christ-event as the determining influence on conduct.

John's doctrine is in harmony with that of Paul. The Paraclete - the Advocate or comforter - is the continuing and effective presence of the Lord himself in the life and witness of his faithful followers. The Fourth Gospel relates the Spirit to worship, word and sacrament, those very spheres and actions within which Christ is made dynamically and vitaly present.

From the statement of the findings of our word-studies, we turn to the consideration of their relation to the issues raised for Biblical Theology by James Barr's work.

The work presented has little to say to the controversy of Barr and Th. Bowman on the theory that the nature of Hebrew thought is revealed in the Hebrew verb-system. There are two reasons for this: first, we have not been concerned to construct a picture of Hebrew thinking and culture and to distinguish this from Greek and Hellenistic thought; and secondly, we have not concentrated attention on the verb, to the exclusion of other parts of speech. We have sought to discover the meanings of certain words in the



contains methodological errors - many of which are obvious to common sense - but also has, as the basis of its construction, a totally wrong idea of the relation between concept and word. Contributors (he maintains) constantly confuse "concept" and "linguistic entity" and so waver between discussing words and discussing the theological realities signified by the words. Now the vexed problem of the relation between "word" and "concept" belongs to the philosophy of language, and Barr does not disclose what standpoint he takes on that subject. However, his rejection of Idealist thought and of psychological factors in linguistic science must cause him to depart from, if not to deny altogether, the theory of meaning which proceeds from the interpretation of language as a form of symbolic expression, in which the word symbolises the thought or reference, which in its turn refers to the feature or event about which we are speaking. According to this commonly-held view, the meaning of a word, as a socially accepted symbol, cannot be gauged by investigating its relation to other words (i.e. by rules of usage) or solely on the basis of context: it can be arrived at only as the reality (of event, experience, perception etc.) which the word symbolises is penetrated and understood. While it is true that words are almost always found embedded in specific contexts, it is also true that a term, standing entirely



by itself, apart from any context, may still have a meaning which is generally accepted and understood.<sup>1</sup> "There is no getting away from the fact", writes G. Stern, an eminent semanticist, "that single words have more or less permanent meanings, that they actually do refer to certain referents, and not to others, and that this characteristic is the indispensable basis of all communication."<sup>2</sup> The single word, therefore, does express, in some sense, the concept, and the search for the meaning of a word requires penetration of the concept. The role of context (both the verbal context and the wider 'context of situation') is to provide precision or determinateness to the meaning of the word.

From the standpoint of this approach to the study of language and meaning, Barr's criticism of the basic conception of TWNT is invalid, although many of his strictures on the individual articles are justified. The dictionary, and, above all, the dictionary which is confessedly theological, must be a word-study and a concept-study. Since each word is a semantic marker or symbol, its

1 "Statements like 'le mot n'est que par le contexte et n'est rien par lui-même' (A. Rosetti, Le Mot: Esquisse d'une théorie générale, 2me ed. Copenhagen, 1947, p.38) which are frequently heard nowadays, are neither accurate nor realistic", S. Ullmann, Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning, p.48.

2 Meaning and Change of Meaning, (Gothenburg, 1931) p.35.



meaning can be understood only as the field of meaning for which it is a marker is penetrated: and the field of meaning adhering to and around theological terms will, of necessity, be theologically oriented, being concerned with the realities of religious experience or with the perception of truth to which the words point. It would seem that Barr has failed to distinguish between the aims and intention of the TWNT and the use made of it by writers of Biblical Theology. The Wörterbuch provides a guide to the material and a synthesis of main themes; it lists the semantic variations which accompany the appearance of words in different contexts and situations of thought: but it is not right to assume (and the editors never meant us to assume) that every occurrence of a particular word carries all the associations worked out in the relevant article. The possibilities for interpretation are listed, but this does not relieve the interpreter of making the decision as to which precise meaning is required by the context with which he is dealing. By way of summary on this matter: Barr's criticism of the basic conception of the TWNT cannot be sustained; words (which ordinarily are the basic tool of the lexicographer) do express general concepts; Barr's calling attention to errors of method in various articles is useful and instructive; the maximum of care must be exercised by scholars in the use they make of and



the authority they give to the Wörterbuch lest they try to make it perform a function for which it was not designed.

Having established the fact that the individual word is entitled to consideration in its own right because it symbolises a generally accepted content, we proceed now to investigate Barr's claim that the impress of the OT-Jewish tradition on NT language and meanings is borne by the things said (i.e. by the sentences and word-combinations) and not by the words used, since these often retained the semantic value which they normally had in the usage of Hellenistic speakers. Of many words this may be true: but of others it is certainly not true, and our studies prove it. The word ἀπολύτρωσις has a dimension of reference with relation to the OT idea of deliverance (channelled to the word through the LXX translation) which it does not possess in classical or Hellenistic Greek. To this argument Barr would reply that such a case is covered by his declaration that the extent of fresh content is related to the degree in which the words became technical. But surely, then, almost all the NT words normally investigated, all the words which are significant theologically, will have to be regarded as "technical". We do not investigate καὶ , ἐγώ , πόλις , θύρα , ἱμάτιον : we do investigate ἀλήθεια , πίστις , δικαιοσύνη , τέλος , ἀπολύτρωσις , πνεῦμα etc. Is Barr not admitting that every theologically significant word (being



technical) has in fact a special content? Now this special content in the Greek terms of the New Testament comes to them, we think, out of the Biblical tradition, and is related especially to the language of the Septuagint which is the locus of that extension of meaning and reference which is due to their Hebrew background. Each of our studies bears witness to the importance of this fact.

The discussion of a special Biblical content for NT meanings leads to the question of the impact of Christianity itself on language. Barr dismisses as "romanticism" the contention that Christianity had a creative and transforming influence on the language used in the New Testament. It is certainly true that too much has been made of the "language-moulding power" of Christianity, but it seems that Barr has overstated his position. The Christian faith and the essential Christ-reference of theological words has influenced the total meaning of NT terms. The Pauline use of πνεῦμα is indebted to the OT-Jewish understanding of "spirit", but the relation to Christ which the term bears in Paul's writing and thought is surely an added dimension within the total meaning of the word in the Apostle's usage. In this case, and also in the case of λόγος, we may say that the impact of Christian faith upon the terms was to give an extension of reference which is important for the understanding of the total meaning. Even more than



this can perhaps be said concerning the term δικαιοσύνη . Here Paul's distinctive understanding of the word (as "justification") is related to an aspect of the OT meaning (viz. the divine "righteousness" which works salvation); this was channelled to the Greek word through the LXX, but, in taking up the word, the Apostle so relates its meaning and significance to the work of Christ that, in his hands, it has a content radically different from any it possessed in Hellenistic thought and usage and linked only with one strand of the OT-Jewish tradition.

The final topic to which we relate our methods and findings is that of the whole activity of writing Biblical Theology. It ought to be remembered that Barr's book is not an attack on Biblical Theology itself, but on the linguistic methods on which many of the statements of recent Biblical theologians have been content to rest. Now the studies which form the bulk of this thesis are not designed to be essays in Biblical theology: they investigate words and seek to understand their meanings as they were used by various authors. This type of work is a preliminary, but a necessary preliminary, to any attempt to construct Biblical theology, and it must be carried out thoroughly and carefully. The development and variations in the use and meaning of Biblical terms must be presented and weighed before any synthesising theological statement is made. At



this point we could comment on the relevance of our studies to certain aspects of soteriological doctrine; for instance, to suggest that the ransom theory of Atonement appears to be based on a one-sided interpretation of the  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\nu$  -words in terms of classical Greek usage; but rather than proceed thus, we would point to our conclusion on this matter: detailed historical and exegetical study, based on the most scrupulous linguistic methods, must precede the construction of any Biblical Theology.

The work here presented is a series of studies in Biblical Semantics. Let the final word of the thesis then be this: if there is one fact which stands out more than any other in our work, it is the significance which must be attached to the language and usage of the Septuagint in any attempt to discover the semantic development and value of terms in the Greek of the New Testament.



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Part 1. Books by modern authors.

Abelson, J., The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912.

Abrahams, I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (2 vols.) Cambridge, 1917-24.

Arndt, W.F. and F.W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature, (Trans. from German of W. Bauer), Cambridge, 1957.

Barr, J., The Semantics of Biblical Language, Oxford University Press, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_, Biblical Words for Time, London: S.C.M. Press, 1962.

Barrett, C.K., The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, London: S.P.C.K., 1947.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel according to St. John, London: S.P.C.K. 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Epistle to the Romans, London, A. and C. Black, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Background of Mark 10.45" in New Testament Essays in memory of F.W. Manson, Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 1-18.

Beare, F.W., The First Epistle of Peter, Oxford: Blackwell, 1947.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Epistle to the Philippians, London: A. and C. Black, 1959.

Bernard, J.H., The Gospel according to St. John, (I.C.C.) Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1928.

Black, M., An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, (2nd ed.) Oxford University Press, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Interpretation of Romans viii.28" in Neotestamentica et Patristica, (Festschrift O. Cullmann), Leiden, 1962, pp. 166-172.



Black, M. and H.H. Rowley, ed., Peake's Commentary on the Bible, (revised edition), Edinburgh: Nelson, 1962.

Boman, Th., Hebrew Thought compared with Greek, (Eng. Trans. by J.L. Moreau), London: S.C.M. Press, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Hebrew and Greek Thought-forms in the New Testament" in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. W. Klassen and G.F. Snyder, London: S.C.M. Press, 1962.

Bonnard, P., L'Épître de St. Paul aux Galates. (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Num. ix) Paris, 1953.

Bonsirven, J., Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ, (2 vols.), Paris, 1934-35.

Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H.J., Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, (Eng. Trans.), London: S.C.M. Press, 1963.

Braun, F.M., ed., L'Évangile de Jean, Paris, 1958.

Browne, L.E., ed. From Babylon to Bethlehem, (2nd rev. ed.) Cambridge: Heffer, 1951.

Bruce, F.F., The Epistle to the Ephesians, London: Pickering and Inglis, 1961.

Büchler, A., Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, London, 1928.

Büchsel, F., Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament, Gütersloh, 1926.

Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament, (trans. K. Grobel: 2 vols.) London: S.C.M. Press, 1952-55.

\_\_\_\_\_, Das Evangelium des Johannes, (16te Auf.), Göttingen, 1959.

Burrows, M., The Dead Sea Scrolls, New York, 1955.

Burton, E.D., Spirit, Soul and Flesh, Chicago University Press, 1918.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Epistle to the Galatians, (ICC), Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1921.

Carmignac, J., La Règle de la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres, Paris, 1958.



- Charles, R.H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Oxford University Press, 1913.
- Chevallier, M.A., L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament, Paris, 1958.
- Colwell, E.C., "The Greek Language" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, (Nashville, 1962), vol.2, pp. 475-487.
- Cullmann, O., The Earliest Christian Confessions (Eng. Trans. by J.K.S. Reid), London: S.C.M. Press, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Baptism in the New Testament, (Eng. Trans. by J.K.S. Reid), London: S.C.M. Press, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Christ and Time, (Eng. Trans. by F.V. Filson) London; S.C.M. Press, 1951.
- Dalglish, E.R., Psalm Fifty-One in the light of ancient and near eastern Patternism, Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Dalman, G., The Words of Jesus, (Eng. Trans. by D.M. Kay), Edinburgh, 1902.
- Danby, H., Trans., The Mishnah, Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Daube, D., Studies in Biblical Law, Cambridge, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956.
- Davidson, A.B., The Theology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1904.
- Davies, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, (2nd ed.) London: S.P.C.K. 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and D. Daube, ed., The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Deissmann, A., Light from the Ancient East, (Eng. Trans. of 4th German ed.) London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.
- Démann, P., The Jewish Faith, London: Burns and Oates, 1961.
- Descamps, A., Les Justes et la Justice dans les évangiles et le Christianisme primitif, Louvain, 1950.



Dodd, C.H., The Epistle to the Romans, (MNTC), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Bible and the Greeks, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Johannine Epistles, (MNTC), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953.

Driver, S.R., Deuteronomy, (2nd ed. ICC), Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1896.

Drummond, J., Philo Judaeus or The Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy, (2 vols.) London and Edinburgh, 1888.

Duncan, G.S., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, (MNTC) London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

Dupont-Sommer, A., The Dead Sea Scrolls, Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.

Eichrodt, W., Theology of the Old Testament, (Eng. Trans. by J.A. Baker) vol. 1, London: S.C.M. Press, 1961.

Fahlgren, K.H., Sedaka: nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im Alten Testament, Uppsala, 1932.

Feuillet, A., Études Johanniques, Bruges: Desclée, 1962.

Firth, J.R., Papers in Linguistics, Oxford University Press, 1957.

Flusser, D., Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Scripta Hierosolymitana, vol.4), Jerusalem, 1958.

Funk, R.W., trans. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, (trans. of Blass-Debrunner), Chicago and Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Gerleman, G., Studies in the Septuagint: (i) Job, Lund, 1946, and (ii) Proverbs, Lund, 1956.

Gordon, Cyrus, H., Ugaritic Literature, Rome, 1942.

Gray, G.B., Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1925.

Gray, J., The Legacy of Canaan, (Suppl. Vol. to VT, no.5) Leiden: Brill, 1957.



- Guillet, J., Thèmes Bibliques, Paris, 1950.
- Gunkel, H., Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, (2te Auf.) Göttingen, 1899.
- Haenchen, E., Die Apostelgeschichte, (Meyer's Kommentar, 12 Auf.) Göttingen, 1959.
- Hamilton, N.Q., The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, (SJT Occasional Papers, No.6), Edinburgh, 1957.
- Hatch, E., Essays in Biblical Greek, Oxford, 1889.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and H.A. Redpath, ed. A Concordance to the Septuagint, (2 vols.) Oxford, 1897.
- Henle, P., ed. Language, Thought and Culture, Ann Arbor, 1958.
- Héring, J., La Première Épître de St. Paul aux Corinthiens (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Num. vii), Paris, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_, La Seconde Épître de St. Paul aux Corinthiens, (Commentaire du NT, Num. viii), Paris, 1958.
- Hermann, Ingo, Kyrios und Pneuma: Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen Hauptbriefe, (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament), Munich, 1961.
- Hertz, J.H., ed. The Authorised Daily Prayer Book with Commentary, London, 1959.
- Holjer, H. ed., Language in Culture, Chicago, 1954.
- Holm-Nielsen, S., Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran, Aarhus, 1960.
- Hooker, M.D., Jesus and the Servant, London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Hoskyns, E.C., The Fourth Gospel, (edited by F.N. Davey) London, 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and F.N. Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament, (3rd ed.) London, 1947.
- Jacob, E., Theology of the Old Testament, (Eng. Trans. by A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958.
- Johnson, A.R., The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1949.



- Johnson, A.R., Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, (2nd ed.) Cardiff, 1961.
- Jongeling, B., Le Rouleau de la Guerre des Manuscrits de Qumran, Assen, 1962.
- Kennedy, H.A.A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Philo's Contribution to Religion, London, 1919.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Klostermann, E., Das Markusevangelium, (2te Auf.) Tübingen, 1926.
- Knox, W.L., The Acts of the Apostles, Cambridge, 1948.
- Koehler, L., Old Testament Theology (Eng. Trans. by A.S. Todd), London: Lutterworth, 1957.
- Kronasser, H., Handbuch der Semasiologie, Heidelberg, 1952.
- Lagrange, M.-J., Épître aux Romains, Paris, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Évangile selon Saint Marc, (6me ed.) Paris, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ, Paris, 1931.
- Lampe, G.W.H., The Seal of the Spirit, London, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke", in Studies in the Gospels (ed. D.E. Nineham) Oxford: Blackwell, 1955, pp.159-200.
- Leenhardt, F.J., The Epistle to the Romans, (Eng. Trans. H. Knight) London: Lutterworth, 1961.
- Lohse, E., Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament, 46), Göttingen, 1955.
- Marmorstein, A., The Doctrine of Merits in the Old Rabbinical Literature, London, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Studies in Jewish Theology, Cambridge, 1950.



- Manson, T.W., The Sayings of Jesus, London: SCM Press, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Ethics and the Gospel, London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_, On Paul and John, London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Masson, C., L'Épître de St. Paul aux Éphésiens, (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Num. ix) Paris, 1953.
- McNeile, A.H., The Gospel according to St. Matthew, London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Mendenhall, G.E., Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, Pittsburgh, 1955.
- Menoud, P.H., "La Mort d'Ananias et de Saphira", Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel, Paris, 1950, pp. 146-154.
- Metzger, B.M., "The Language of the New Testament" in The Interpreter's Bible, Nashville and New York, 1951-57, Vol. vii, pp. 43-59.
- Milik, J.T., Ten Years' of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Moffatt, J., The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, (MNTC) London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Montefiore, C.G. and H. Loewe, ed., A Rabbinic Anthology, New York: Meridian Books Inc., 1938.
- Moore, G.F., Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era, (3 vols.) Harvard University Press and Oxford, 1927-1930.
- Morris, L., The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, London: Tyndale Press, 1955.
- Moulton, J.H. and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London, 1914-1929.
- Müssner, F., ZΩΗ - Die Anschauung von 'Leben' im vierten Evangelium, Munich, 1952.
- Nineham, D.E., ed. Studies in the Gospels, Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.
- Nötscher, F., Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte, Bonn, 1956.



- Peake, A.S., ed. The People and the Book, Oxford, 1925.
- Pedersen, J., Israel: Its Life and Culture, (2 vols.) London, 1926-40.
- Philonenko, M., Les Interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qumran, Paris, 1960.
- Porzig, W., Das Wunder der Sprache, Bern, 1950.
- von Rad, G., Theologie des Alten Testaments, (Band 1), Munich, 1957, 3te Auf. 1961.
- Robinson, J.A.T., The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology, London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Robinson, H.W., The Cross of the Servant, London, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Rowley, H.H., ed., The Old Testament and Modern Study, Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Sanday, W. and A.C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans, (ICC), 8th ed. Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1902.
- Schechter, S., Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, London, 1909.
- Schlatter, A., Der Evangelist Johannes, Stuttgart, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Der Evangelist Matthäus, Stuttgart, 1957.
- Schoeps, H.J., Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, (Eng. Ed.), London: Lutterworth, 1961.
- Schrenk, G. et alii, Righteousness, (Bible Key Words), London: A. and C. Black, 1951.
- Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, (Eng. ed.) London, 1931.
- Schweizer, E., Lordship and Discipleship, London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Spirit of God, (Bible Key Words), London: A. and C. Black, 1960.



- Schweizer, E., "Gegenwart des Geistes und Eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des NT" in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge, 1956.
- Scott, C.A.A., Christianity according to St. Paul, Cambridge, 1927.
- Scott, E.F., The Spirit in the New Testament, London, 1923.
- Selwyn, E.G., The First Epistle of St. Peter, London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Simpson, E.K., Words worth weighing in the Greek New Testament, London: Tyndale Press, 1946.
- Skinner, J., Isaiah, (2 vols. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge, 1896-98.
- Slama-Cazacu, T., Langage et Contexte, The Hague: Mouton, 1961.
- Smith, W. Robertson, The Prophets of Israel (2nd ed.) London, 1927.
- Snaith, N.H., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London: Epworth Press, 1944.
- Spicq, C., L'Épître aux Hébreux, (2 vols.) Paris, 1952-53.
- Stendahl, K. ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament, London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Strecker, G., Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, Göttingen, 1962.
- Swete, H.B., Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1900.
- Taylor, V., Behind the Third Gospel, Oxford, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Jesus and His Sacrifice, London, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel according to St. Mark, London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Thackeray, H.St.J., The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, London, 1900.



Turner, N., "The Language of the New Testament" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black and H.H. Rowley, Nelson, 1962, pp. 659-662.

\_\_\_\_\_, Syntax: Volume 3 of J.H. Moulton's A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1963.

Ullmann, S., The Principles of Semantics, (2nd ed.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_, Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning, Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.

Urban, W.M., Language and Reality, London, 1939.

de Vaux, R., Ancient Israel: its Life and Institutions, (Eng. Trans. by J. McHugh), London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961.

Vermès, G., Discovery in the Judaean Desert, New York: Desclee, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, (Haggadic Studies), Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Vols, P., Der Geist Gottes, Tübingen, 1910.

Vriezen, Th., An Outline of Old Testament Theology, (Eng. ed.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.

Weiser, A., The Psalms (Eng. trans.) London: SCM Press, 1962.

Whorf, B.L., Four Articles on Metalinguistics, Washington, 1952.

\_\_\_\_\_, Language Thought and Reality, ed. J.B. Carroll, New York and M.I.T., 1956.

Wilkinson, J., Interpretation and Community, London: Macmillan, 1963.

Williams, C.S.C., The Acts of the Apostles, London: A. and C. Black, 1957.

Wolfson, H.A., Philo: Foundations of religious philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, (2 vols.) Harvard University Press, 1947.

van der Woude, A.S., Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, Assen, 1957.



Wright, G.E., The Old Testament against its Environment,  
London: SCM Press, 1950.

Yates, J.E., The Spirit and the Kingdom, London: SPCK, 1963.

de Yonge, M., The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,  
Assen, 1953.

## Part 2. Periodical Literature.

Anderson, A.A., "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM"  
JSS, vii, (1962) pp. 293-303.

Bacon, B.W., "The Festival of Lives given for the Nation in  
Jewish and Christian Faith", Hibbert Journal, xv, (1917)  
pp. 256-278.

Bammel, E., "Zum jüdischen Märtyrerkult", TLZ, lxxviii,  
(1953) pp. 119-126.

Barr, J., "Hypostasization of Linguistic Phenomena in  
Modern Theological Interpretation", JSS, vii, (1962),  
pp. 85-94.

Basilius, H., "Neo-Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics", Word, viii,  
(1952), pp. 95-105.

Barrett, C.K., "The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth  
Gospel", ET, lix, (1947-8), pp. 302-305.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel", JTS (n.s.)  
i, (1950), pp. 1-15.

Best, E., "Spirit-Baptism", NT, iv, (1960) pp. 236-43.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Matthew V.3", NTS, vii, (1960-61) pp. 255-58.

Birkeland, H., "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead  
in the Old Testament", ST, lxi, (1950) pp. 60-78.

Black, M., "The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch",  
JTS (n.s.) lxi, (1952) pp. 1-10.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Theological Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls",  
SEA, xviii-xix, (1953-54) pp. 72-97.

Dodd, C.H., "ἱλασκεσθαι, its cognates, derivatives and  
synonyms in the Septuagint", JTS, xxxii, (1931)  
pp. 352-60.



- Downing, J., "Jesus and Martyrdom", JTS (n.s.) xiv, (1963) pp. 279-93.
- Ebeling, G., "The Meaning of 'Biblical Theology'", JTS (n.s.), vi, (1955) pp. 210-225.
- Fouillet, A., "La citation d'Hab.2.4 et les huit premiers chapitres de l'épître aux Romains", NTS, vi, (1959-60), pp. 52-80.
- Foerster, W., "Der Heilige Geist im Spätjudentum", NTS, viii (1961-62), pp. 117-134.
- Frey, J.B., "La vie de l'au-delà, dans les conceptions juives au temps de Jésus-Christ", Biblica, xiii, (1932), pp. 129-168.
- Friedrich, G., "Die Problematik eines theologischen Wörterbuchs zum neuen Testament", Studia Evangelica, (ed. K. Aland, Berlin, 1959).
- Gehman, H.S., "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek", VT, i, (1951) pp. 81-90.
- Goodspeed, E.J., "Some Greek Notes: III Justification", JBL, lxxiii, (1954), pp. 86-91.
- Grelot, P., "La Géographie Mythique d'Hénoch et ses Sources Orientales", RB, lxxv, (1958) pp. 33-69.
- Grundmann, W., "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran und die Frage nach der Glaubensgerechtigkeit in der Theologie des Apostels Paulus", Revue de Qumran, ii, (1959-60), pp. 237-59.
- Guthrie, M., "The Bible and Current Theories about Language", The Bible Translator, v, (1954), pp. 150-59.
- Hehn, J., "Zum Problem des Geistes im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament", ZAW, xliii, (1925), pp. 210-25.
- Honeyman, A.M., "Notes and Communications: Notes on a Teacher and a Book", JJS, iv, (1953), pp. 131-32.
- Hooke, S.H., "The Translation of Romans 1.4", NTS, ix, (1962-63), pp. 370-71.
- Hyatt, J.P., "The View of Man in the Qumran 'Hodayot'", NTS, ii, (1955-56), pp. 276-84.



- van Imschoot, P., "L'esprit de Yahvé, source de vie dans l'AT", RB, xlv, (1935) pp. 481-501.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Sagesse et Esprit dans l'AT", RB, xlvii, (1938), pp. 23-49.
- Jenni, E., "Das Wort 'olam im Alten Testament", ZAW, lxiv, (1952), pp. 197-248, lxv, (1953), pp. 1-38.
- Johnson, A.R., "The Primary Meaning of  $\sqrt{\text{בן אלהים}}$ ", VT, Suppl. vol. 1, (1953), pp. 67-77.
- Johnson, S.E., "Paul and the Manual of Discipline", HTR, xlviii, (1955), pp. 157-65.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke 23.47", JTS, xliii, (1942), pp. 34-36.
- Kuhn, K.G., "Romans 6.7", ZNW, xxx, (1931) pp. 305-310.
- Laurin, R.B., "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'", JSS, iii, (1958), pp. 344-355.
- Légaré, S., "Les Pauvres en esprit et les 'Volontaires' de Qumran", NTS, viii, (1961-62) pp. 336-48.
- Lyonnet, S., "De 'Justitia Dei' in Epistula ad Romanos 1.17 et 3.21,22", Verbum Domini, xxv, (1947) pp. 23-34, 118-121, 129-144, 193-203, 257-263.
- Malkiel, Y., "The Place of Etymology in Linguistic Research", Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, xxxi, (1954), pp. 78-90.
- Manson, T.W., "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ", JTS, xlv, (1945), pp. 1-10.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Entry into Membership of the Early Church", JTS, xlviii, (1947), pp. 25-33.
- May, H.G., "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in Old Testament Imagery", JBL, lxxxii, (1963), pp. 1-14.
- Milik, J.T., "Hénoch au pays des aromates", RB, lxv, (1958), pp. 70-77.
- Morris, L., "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3.25", NTS, ii, (1955-56), pp. 33-43.
- Mowinkel, S., "The Spirit and the Word in the pre-exilic reforming Prophets", JBL, lxi, (1934), pp. 199-227.



- Oepke, A., "Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ bei Paulus in neuer Beleuchtung", TLZ, lxxviii, (1953), pp. 257-64.
- Öhman, S., "Theories of the 'Linguistic Field'", Word, ix, (1953), pp. 123-34.
- Orlinsky, H.M., "The New Jewish Version of the Torah", JBL, lxxxi, (1963), pp. 249-64.
- Parson, H., "The Ruah Hakodesh in Tannaitic Literature", JQR, xx, (1929-30), pp. 51-76.
- Pedersen, J., "Wisdom and Immortality", VT, Suppl. Vol.3, (1955), pp. 238-246.
- van der Ploeg, J., "L'Immortalité de l'homme d'après les Textes de la Mer Morte", VT, ii, (1952), pp. 171-75.
- Robinson, J.A.T., "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community", HTR, 1, (1957), pp. 175-191.
- Ropes, J.H., "'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul", JBL, xxi, (1903), pp. 211-227.
- Schulz, S., "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus", ZTK, lvi, (1959), pp. 155-185.
- Seroggs, R., "Romans vi.7", NTS, x, (1963-64) pp. 104-108.
- Stendahl, K., "Implications of Form-criticism and Tradition-criticism for Biblical Interpretation", JBL, lxxvii, (1958), pp. 33-38.
- Stevens, W.A., "On the Forensic Meaning of Δικαιοσύνη", AJT, 1, (1897), pp. 443-450.
- Swanson, J.W., "Linguistic Relativity and Translation", Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, xxi, (Dec. 1961), pp. 185-192.
- Teicher, J.L., "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Documents of the Jewish Christian Sect of Ebionites", JJS, ii, (1951), pp. 67-99.
- Turner, N., "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek", VT, v, (1955), pp. 208-213.
- van Unnik, W.C., "Jesus the Christ", NTS, viii, (1961-62) pp. 101-116.



- Wallace, D.H., "Biblical Theology: Past and Future", TZ, xix, (1963), pp. 88-105.
- Warfield, B.B., "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption", PTR, xv, (1917), pp. 201-249.
- Watson, N.M., "Some Observations on the use of Δικαιώσ in the Septuagint", JBL, lxxix, (1960), pp. 255-266.
- Watson, P.S., "The Nature and Function of Biblical Theology", ET, lxxiii, (1962), pp. 195-200.
- Weingreen, J., "The Title Moreh Sedek", JSS, vi, (1961), pp. 162-174.
- Wernberg-Møller, P., "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community, 1Q Serek 3.13-4.26", Revue de Qumran, iiii, (1961), pp. 413-441.
- Yates, J.E., "The Form of Mark 1.8b", NTS, iv, (1957-58), pp. 334-338.
- de Yonge, M., "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", NT, iv, (1960), pp. 182-235.